School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1415957

Mooted Questions of History

Humphrey J. Desmond.

Thomas G. Alleson

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

270

Mooted Questions of History

46
D4
1901

Mooted Questions of History

REVISED EDITION

By

HUMPHREY J. DESMOND

Author of "The Church and the Law," "Outlooks and Insights," etc.

BOSTON · MARLIER AND COMPANY, Limited · *MDCCCCII*

Copyright, 1895, 1900,
by H. J. DESMOND

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Second Impression

PREFACE

The plan pursued in the following pages is to give, under each topic, a succinct statement of the facts, — embodying the leading points of information necessary to a clear view; and to follow this with quotations from some well-known historians, indicating briefly their judgment upon the whole case, or upon controverted points thereof.

Several new chapters and some fifty quotations have been added in the revision. It has not been deemed advisable to enlarge the treatment of any of the topics, inasmuch as the merit sought for the book is brevity. A number of footnotes, however, have been added.

CONTENTS

		Page
	Historical Attitudes, Past and Present	1
I.	The "Dark Ages"	16
II.	Christianity as a Civilizer	37
III.	"The Monks of Old"	52
IV.	The Papal Power	65
V.	The Crusades	84
VI.	Premature Protestantisms	95
VII.	Savonarola	107
VIII.	Bibles before Luther	117
IX.	The Revival of Learning	128
X.	Indulgences	140
XI.	The Cause and Success of Protestantism	153
XII.	Character of the Reformers	164
XIII.	The Reformation and Religious Liberty	171
XIV.	The Reformation and Civil Liberty	186
XV.	Two Political Theories of the Reformation Time	197
XVI.	The Reformation and Literature	201

		Page
XVII.	"Bloody Mary" and "Good Queen Bess"	211
XVIII.	The Inquisition	218
XIX.	The Jesuits	230
XX.	The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day	249
XXI.	The Edict of Nantes	261
XXII.	The Persecution of the Irish	268
XXIII.	Galileo	285
XXIV.	The Gunpowder Plot	296
XXV.	The "Popish Plot"	303
XXVI.	The Lord Gordon Riots	309
XXVII.	Maryland led the Way	313

MOOTED QUESTIONS OF HISTORY

HISTORICAL ATTITUDES, PAST AND PRESENT

IN an essay which he contributed to the "Edinburgh Review" nearly seventy years ago, Macaulay indicates his conception of the good historian by suggesting that if Lord Clarendon, instead of filling hundreds of folio pages with copies of state papers, had condescended to be "the Boswell of the Long Parliament," he would have proven not only more interesting but also more accurate. In a subsequent essay written in review of Hallam's "Constitutional History of England," Macaulay says that the ideal history is "a compound of poetry and philosophy," something which calls into play the imagination as well as the reason. These are the opinions of a

comparatively recent historian, and yet they present a decided contrast with current conceptions of what good historical writing should be.

Macaulay, who will perhaps be remembered more as an essayist than as an historian, said enough, in the article to which I have alluded, to make clear, even to the historians of his own age, the prime necessity of greater accuracy; yet such is not the lesson that he particularly enforces. With him, it is still a question of style rather than of facts, of ability to interest rather than the ability to separate the chaff of legend from the grain of truth. The modern essayist reviews the ancient historians, but his criticism is not that they are deficient either in rhetoric or interest: Herodotus manufactures the speeches he puts in the mouths of Aristides and Gelon. History as written by Thucydides "calls into play the imagination quite as much as the reason." Xenophon places, on the pages of his sober chronicles, dreams, omens, and prophecies for which he asks equal credence. As for Livy, "no historian with whom we are acquainted has shown so complete indifference to truth," says

Macaulay. And so on with the rest of the ancients. "Nothing," says Professor Mahaffy, "shows more clearly the wonderful importance of style and literary genius than the way in which such authors as Tacitus and Thucydides blind modern commentators in questions of evidence. Tacitus has been clearly proven from his own statements thoroughly untrustworthy."

As for the modern historians, Macaulay thinks that the best of them have been "seduced from truth not by their imagination but by their reason." Hume he regards as an accomplished advocate, with all the vices of the special pleader. Robertson and Gibbon are little better. President Adams of Wisconsin University, in a "Manual of Historical Literature," published some years ago, continues these rather unfavorable judgments on well-known historians. For instance, he thinks that for the purpose of strict historical information the account which Hume gives of a particular period of history is of no more value than the account of Sir Walter Scott in "The Fortunes of Nigel." The likes and

dislikes of Froude are too intense ever to allow him to be strictly judicial. Indeed, during an interchange of amenities, Professor Freeman has intimated that Froude was constitutionally unable to tell the truth. Kinglake, who may be said to have held a brief against Napoleon Third, writes as "an energetic hater." As for Macaulay himself, while the consummate art of his "History of England" as a literary creation is conceded, yet he is always the victim of an intense partisan spirit, and therefore all of his writings have "something of the flavor of a political pamphlet."

Of Von Holst's "Constitutional History of the United States," which enforces so gloomy a view of our institutions, President Adams says: "If the judicious pecuniary support given to the author for the prosecution of his investigation by the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, and alluded to in the preface of the third volume, had been granted for the express purpose of subsidizing a systematic attempt to undermine the foundation of republican institutions and throw ridicule upon them in the eyes of the royalists,

the academy would have abundant reasons to be satisfied with the result."

"What is history," asked Napoleon, "but merely fable agreed upon?" De Maistre did not hesitate to indict all the history of the last three centuries as a conspiracy against truth. "As time rolled on," to use the words of Ignatius Donnelly, "it was seen that the greater part of history was simply recorded legends; while all the rest represented the passions of factions, the hates of sects, or the servility and venality of historians."

But at last we reach an epoch when it is increasingly true that

> "The legendary tales that pleased of yore
> Can charm an understanding age no more."

A new science of history has come into being with the present generation. The interest that we have in the historians of the past becomes chiefly a literary interest.

History perhaps can never become an exact science; the human element will inevitably assert itself to some extent. Race and religious sympathies will warp human judgments; but if we have more faith-

fulness to scientific methods of investigation — a more careful application of the rules of evidence in reviewing old authorities and new testimony, with truer and broader perspectives, — there are grounds for expecting excellent results in the future. We may mention, as points of excellence in the history that the present age is writing: first, the disposition to look for the best means of information, to consult and to weigh adequately documentary sources; second, the disposition to discuss and investigate facts more critically, to revise previously held judgments, and to gain a true perspective of events; and third, greater impartiality and a more sincere disposition to seek and publish truth for truth's sake.

The more scientific method of historical writing owes its beginning to the disposition on part of historians to go to the best documentary sources for their facts. Possibly we may say that the Bollandists in the compilation of the "Acta Sanctorum" were the real originators of this method. Their care and erudition in throwing the chaff of legendary miracles and wonder-working out of the lives of the saints

whom they commemorated, had about it many of the methods of the best modern historians.

Michelet, in 1836, claims to have been the pioneer of the "documentary age" of history; but at that time most of the archives were still closed to the investigator. The new epoch really began in 1859. Then, Italy leading the way, most of the other governments of Europe threw open their archives. As late as June, 1895, Lord Acton said in an address at Oxford: "We are still at the beginning of the documentary age which will tend to make history independent of historians." Ranke, one of the most careful as well as the most colorless of historians, did most of his work prior to the documentary age, and all of his seventy volumes, in the opinion of Lord Acton, might be rewritten to advantage. President Adams, in discussing Hazlitt's Life of Napoleon, says that all histories of the Napoleonic epoch written prior to the publication of "the Napoleon Correspondence" must be regarded as incomplete and imperfect. As illustrating the influence of the introduction of new documentary evi-

dence upon accepted historical opinions, we may mention the unfavorable impression which the recent publication of the Memoirs of Barras has had on the reputation of Josephine. The throwing open of the Spanish archives discovered the letters of De Quadra, an envoy of Spain to the court of Queen Elizabeth, and these letters threw new light on one of the dark deeds of the reign, — the suspected murder of Amy Robsart. As the wife of Lord Dudley she stood in the way of his ambition to wed the queen. All evidence of the suspected crime had been removed so far as the British state papers went, — as indeed they might, for this tragedy of guilty love was enacted almost at the steps of the throne. But here, after four hundred years, comes testimony showing that even in high court circles the advisability of poisoning the neglected wife was considered some time in advance of her death.

Especially with reference to the view which historians have taken of the middle ages have later researches worked a revolution. Palgrave says that for years a "dead-set" was made against those ages as periods

of darkness and superstition. This conspiracy against the middle ages received a setback in the scholarly work of Hallam, but upon other grounds even Hallam has become obsolete. "Researches in France and Germany," says President Adams, "have added so much to the fund of mediæval history that very little of what has been written thirty years ago can now be regarded as conclusive authority." As to the influence of more careful and impartial criticism of later historians, many instances might be furnished of old errors dispelled and truer conceptions arrived at. The application of the rules of evidence to methods of historical research is finely illustrated in the discussion by John Fiske of the William Tell myth; or in the discussion by Baring-Gould of the story of the alleged female Pope Joan. The William Tell myth had found its way for years into respectable history unquestioned. Swiss patriotism swore by it. Indeed, one adventurous writer who doubted this interesting story was condemned in 1760 by the Canton of Uri, in Switzerland, to be burned to death.

The story of the female Pope Joan re-

ceives credence even in so pretentious a work as Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History." Both myths appear to have originated some two hundred years after the time, it is alleged, Pope Joan and William Tell, respectively, lived. Both stories were repeated time and time again in different countries, and grew in detail as they grew in age. Modern historians have found both entirely unsupported by any credible testimony. Fiske shows how the William Tell story makes its appearance in Denmark, Iceland, and the Rhine country, every detail being identical, even to the passage where Tell explains that the arrow was hidden "to kill thee, tyrant, had I slain my son."

Referring to contemporary accounts of the famous "Popish plot," Macaulay indicates something of the hereafter of partisan history by remarking: "These stories [one of which represented that the Catholics started the great London fire of 1666] are now altogether exploded. They have been abandoned by statesmen to aldermen, by aldermen to clergymen, by clergymen to old women, and by old women to Sir Harcourt Lees."

There are other stories which have also gotten down to the credulity of Sir Harcourt Lees or his counterparts in our generation. It is scarcely necessary to allude to them here; they have passed from history to controversy, from controversy to legendary, and from legendary to a place beside the narratives of Baron Munchausen and the escapades of Little Red Riding Hood. There are historical traditions, however, that are in the process, and not so far advanced as these. Aldermen yet believe them. Clergymen (sad to say) tell them. Or, if given up in such quarters, old women still pin their faith to them, and make them the material for nursery yarns to bias the minds of children, and unconsciously affect the adult judgment in after years.

Of course there is some iconoclasm about this sifting of the old legends. We are deprived of some picturesque incidents. Doubt is thrown upon the "winged words" of many historical figures. We can no longer be sure that Louis XIV. said "I am the state," or that Galileo declared, "It still moves," or that Wellington said at Waterloo, "Up, guards, and at them." But these interest-

ing episodes may be still preserved. The classification is wrong, It is only necessary to transfer them from the department of history to that of fiction.

In the matter of gaining a truer perspective of the past, the modern historian is also at an advantage. In the earlier years of the century the historians, who instructed the English-speaking races, made Napoleon and Wellington of equal stature. Time has left Bonaparte still monumental, but Wellington has dwindled in the great Corsican's shadow. In the eighteenth century Brutus was the pet of the liberty-loving orators and publicists; in the nineteenth century this judgment is reversed, and it is perceived that Cæsar was the real friend of the democratic movement, and Brutus but a heroic reactionary. There was recently published Babbington's "Fallacies of Race Theories," wherein such carelessly accepted opinions as that of Tacitus on the ancient Germans and that of Mommsen on the ancient Gauls are subjected to analysis and found wanting. Tacitus was never in Germany, yet because he praised the Germans as a chaste and virtuous people he has be-

come a race authority. Mr. Babbington says: "The Germans, who assume to be our teachers in history as in everything else, make the cause of their ancestors a personal one, ransack all the writers of antiquity to prove the virtues of the Teutons and the vices of the Romans," and as a consequence "the measure of liberty and virtue modern nations possess is attributed to the influence of German blood and German ideas;" which position is not at all so certain when we go back of the race eulogists and re-examine the facts.

The truth of history is most commonly tampered with, not by pure inventions, but rather in matters of more or less plausibility concerning the *details* — which color events; of going to the question of *motives* — which determine the credit or the guilt of acts and occurrences.[1]

[1] As Professor Prothero truthfully said at Edinburgh University: "Take any great movement you please — the Crusades, for instance, or the Reformation; analyze it as minutely as possible, ascertain all its conditions, its general causes, its immediate occasions — there remains the incalculable human element, which defies the processes of exact science. We cannot be certain of this man's motives, nor measure the influence which that man exerted.

A careful sifting process is necessary to get at the undoubted facts in all controverted cases, and, as the ordinary reader cannot afford the time or expense of original investigation and research, it seems a more practical course to call in the reputable historians of all schools and sects, and from their testimony to get as near to the truth as possible.[1]

We must not permit ourselves to be the dupes of those fierce partisans who lived in other ages and wished their opponents to be misjudged by posterity. We are not properly part of this elder age of the world unless we share its maturer judgment, and unless we possess its ability of seeing through the one-sided details presented by the skilled apologists of parties and sects, in less instructed centuries, to defend their actions or to asperse the conduct of their adversaries.

The human element in the subject calls out the human element in the student. Not only is the investigation obscured, but the sympathies of the investigator are aroused, and his judgment is liable to be warped at every turn. History alone suffers from this doubly distorting medium. Other sciences are free from its effects."

[1] "Historic truth never can be elicited save by comparison," says Sir Francis Palgrave ("History of Normandy and England," Preface).

Neither do we want to inherit the partisan prejudices of conflicts waged in former centuries. Our condition for a cooler and more deliberate judgment is better, and our perspective for giving the facts their just importance is also better. We must not have the opinions of angry, uncharitable, unwise men forced upon us; but we must seek for ourselves the broad, dispassionate, accurate view that alone can make the lessons of the past helpful. Our loyalty to Truth is above all loyalty to any institution or party, past or present.

In a survey of a series of controverted historical topics, this will occur as a safe method of procedure:

1. What are the facts of the case, as fairly conceded by all sides?

2. What is a just estimate from a general survey of the matter, on the basis of these facts?

3. Is this estimate borne out by the opinions of historians who are ranged, so far as the general issue goes, on the other side? If that be the case, then the facts and the conclusions may be regarded as reasonably certain.

I

THE "DARK AGES"

"I know nothing of those ages which knew nothing." . . . I have often thought I should have liked to ask him how he came to know so curious and important a fact respecting ages of which he knew nothing. — MAITLAND.

IT has been pertinently said, that the "darkness" of certain mediæval centuries is all in the minds of the persons applying the term. From those distant shores of the past, very few echoes reach us in these first years of the twentieth century. Superficial observation has concluded that there was "little going on," and that the entire population was, as the phrase is, "sunk in ignorance," not to mention "superstition" and "barbarism."

De Maistre's notion that history is "a conspiracy against truth" receives some illustration in this attitude towards the middle ages. "A dead set," says Sir Fran-

cis Palgrave, "has been made against the middle ages as periods immersed in darkness, ignorance, and barbarity. But, most of all, have these censures been directed against mediæval Christianity."[1] Fleury indicates that this conspiracy to blacken the middle ages began with the Humanists of the Renaissance period. Their movement was a reaction against the old learning; to commend the new tone they wished to impart to civilization, it was necessary to deprecate the old. The Reformation readily adopted the same unfavorable view; and the sceptical writers of the eighteenth century had a natural antipathy to ages dominated, as the mediæval centuries were, by Christianity. The more researchful historian of the nineteenth century has been disturbing this censorious judgment against the middle ages, by manifesting a disposition to go over the ground again in a more scientific spirit.

The term "dark ages" has been deemed comprehensive enough to cover the ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The masses in those ages could

[1] History of Normandy and England (Preface).

neither read nor write. We find in legal instruments of the time: "And the aforesaid lord hath declared, that he does not know how to sign his name, owing to the fact of his being a nobleman." And a knight being asked to read the Scriptures, retorted: "I am not a clerk; I have a family to support."[1]

Illiteracy, however, is not ignorance. Nor would inability to read mean as much in the ninth century as it does in the twentieth. Let the world of to-day lose the "art preservative of the arts," — printing; let the newspaper vanish from the land, and the cheap school book be a thing of the past; throw us back to the condition of manuscript books, multiplied slowly and painfully, — and instead of five million illiterates, such as we have to-day in this land of light and progress, we might have twenty or thirty millions.

The illiterate people in the ages previous to the invention of printing were more intelligent, for their time, than are the illiterate of to-day. To be unable to read

[1] Maitland, however, inclines to think that illiteracy was not so common as these instances might seem to indicate.

nowadays means backwardness, neglect of opportunities, and stupidity. Quite the contrary in the mediæval epoch: illiteracy was excusable, and, in a certain sense, fashionable, inasmuch as it was a common condition. The naturally intelligent, who in our day would be "common-schooled," were, in that epoch, illiterate.

Another consideration that must be borne in mind in instituting comparisons between the ninth and the nineteenth century is the circumstances of mediæval civilization. For over three centuries (to A. D. 750) civilized Europe was the field of successive waves of barbarian conquest. Franks, Goths, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals, Alans, Huns, and Lombards followed each other with destructive incursions. One wave pushed the other further on. The barbarians apparently did not conquer for the purpose of occupying the soil and building up empires, but for the purpose of plunder. The condition was consequently one of continued commotion through several generations. The case of the Vandals is in point: they pushed through France and settled for a time in Spain; later, eighty thousand of

them crossed, under Genseric, to Carthage, where a Vandal empire was established for almost a century; and the Vandals, organized as pirates, came down upon the commerce of the Mediterranean and even returned to desolate Rome. Attila inflicted himself as the "scourge of God" upon Christian Europe. The Northmen broke the calm after the other barbarians had subsided, and the Moslem invasion from the South was only checked by Charles Martel after a desperate battle (A. D. 732). The assimilation of ten successive waves of northern barbarians, and the blow such invasions meant to existing and civilizing institutions made the task of mediæval society most difficult and gradual.

Civilization had, in fact, to be begun over. We do not call a boy decrepit because he lacks the strength of a man. Neither ought we to slur the society of the tenth century as "dark" and "ignorant" because it did not rapidly attain the standards of our day. There is no responsibility where the conditions are natural and inexorable. The mediæval centuries were constantly forcing the civilization and culture of European

society forward. It was the germinating epoch of the modern world. There was no standing still, no retrogression. There was constant advance. In the epoch that in the retrospect seems most hopeless and unprogressive, *i. e.*, about the close of the tenth century, several conspicuous inventions were made that the modern world finds of indispensable value: clocks were constructed by the monk Gerbert, the musical scale by the monk Guy, and another monk in 1285 devised spectacles.[1] Common schools for the masses date even a little earlier, and some of the great universities of modern Europe were founded in the spirit of improvement that strongly evinced itself.

The nineteenth century goes back to the eleventh to admire the magnificent Gothic architecture that flourished in that epoch, leaving monuments that are copied in the finest temples of to-day.[2] And the state of

[1] Gunpowder was invented about the year 1278. Arabic notation came into use about the year 1275. Paper was manufactured from rags early in the twelfth century. In the same century the mariner's compass came into use.

[2] Under the influence of Pugin, the second quarter of the nineteenth century saw a revival, especially in Eng-

architecture has been shrewdly accepted by historians as one of the safest gauges of the progress attained in the other arts.

Out of a library of the literature of the middle ages, consisting of great folios of "the Fathers," tomes of historical annals and "monkish chronicles," and a whole department of poetry and fiction, three great books have come down to us from those centuries, each bearing the stamp of immortality. Thomas Aquinas (1224–74) left to the world the "Summa Theologica," which has for six hundred years been the standard authority on the teachings of the great church of Christendom.

Dante (1265–1321) wrote the "Divina Commedia," which has won him a name in the world of literature unsurpassed by any writer of the Christian era, Shakespeare alone excepted.

Thomas à Kempis (1380–1471) wrote the "Imitation of Christ," which has been translated into more languages than any other book except the Bible. In the

land and America, of the Gothic architecture of the fifteenth century. It had been discarded for three hundred years, but now it was enthusiastically revived.

Cologne library there are samples of six hundred editions of this work, brought out in the nineteenth century alone.

HALLAM: Limits of the epoch

"It is not possible to fix accurate limits to the middle ages; though the ten centuries from the fifth to the fifteenth seem, in a general point of view, to constitute that period."

Hallam, The Middle Ages, pref. to first edition.

GOLDWIN SMITH: "Ages of light"

"Hume and Robertson," says Goldwin Smith, "have long been consigned to disgrace for their want of accurate erudition, especially in relation to the middle ages, which to them are merely the dark ages: while to the mediævalist of our day they appear to be the special ages of light."

PALGRAVE: Unjust disparagement of the middle ages

"Abstractedly from all the influences which we have sustained in common with the rest of the civilized commonwealth, our British disparagement of the middle ages

has been exceedingly enhanced by our grizzled ecclesiastical or church historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. . . . These 'standard works,' accepted and received as Canonical Books, have tainted the nobility of our national mind. An adequate parallel to their bitterness, their shabbiness, their shirking, their habitual disregard of honor and veracity, is hardly afforded, even by the so-called 'Anti-Jacobin' press during the revolutionary and Imperial wars. The history of Napoleon, his generals, and the French nation, collected from these exaggerations of selfish loyalty, rabid aversion, and panic terror, would be the match of our popular and prevailing ideas concerning Hildebrand, or Anselm, or Becket, or Innocent III., or mediæval Catholicity in general, grounded upon our ancestral traditionary 'standard ecclesiastical authorities,' such as Burnett's 'Reformation,' or Fox's 'Book of Martyrs.' . . . The scheme of, and intent of, mediæval Catholicity was to render faith the all-actuating and all-controlling vitality. . . . So far as the system extended, it had the effect of connecting every social element

with Christianity. And Christianity being thus wrought up into the mediæval system, every mediæval institution, character, or mode of thought afforded the means or vehicle for the vilification of Christianity. Never do these writers, or their School, whether in France or in Great Britain, Voltaire or Mably, Hume, Robertson, or Henry, treat the Clergy or the Church with fairness, not even with common honesty. If historical notoriety enforces the allowance of any merit to a priest, the effect of this extorted acknowledgment is destroyed by a happy turn, a clever insinuation, or a coarse innuendo. Consult, for example, Hume, when compelled to notice Archbishop Hubert's exertions in procuring the concession of the Magna Charta; and Henry, narrating the communications which passed between Gregory the Great and Saint Austin."

Sir Francis Palgrave, History of Normandy and England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1878. (Preface, pp. xiv-xviii.)

EMERSON: Human thought never more active

"In modern Europe the middle ages were called the Dark Ages, ten centuries,

from the fifth to the fifteenth. Who dares to call them so now? They gave us decimal numbers, gunpowder, glass, chemistry, and Gothic architecture; and their paintings are the delight and tuition of our age. . . . The darkness of those times arises from our own want of information, not from the absence of intelligence that distinguished them. Human thought was never more active and never produced greater results in any period of the world."

Emerson, "Progress of Culture," in Letters and Social Aims, p. 204. Boston, 1895.

CARLYLE: Shakespeare the flowerage of the middle ages

"This glorious Elizabethan era, with its Shakespeare as the outcome and flowerage of all which had preceded it, is itself attributable to the Catholics of the middle ages. The Christian faith, which was the theme of Dante's song, had produced the practical life which Shakespeare was to sing."

Carlyle, "Hero and Poet."

MAITLAND: Our grandsires of the dark ages

"I cannot help wishing that the reader who has formed his idea of the dark ages only from some modern popular writers — I do not mean those who have written professedly on the subject — could be at once fairly thrown back into the midst of them. I cannot help thinking that he would feel very much as I did the first time that I found myself in a foreign country. A thousand novelties attracted my attention. . . . Well, and these old folks of the dark ages were our grandfathers and grandmothers; and, in a good many points, vastly like ourselves, though we may not at first see the resemblance in the few smoky family pictures which have come down to us; but 'had they not eyes?' 'had they not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions, fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer' as we are? 'Yes; but they knew nothing.' Well, then it is strange to

think how they could do and say so much as they did without any knowledge."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, pp. 30–31. London: John Hodges, Pub., 1890.

BLACKSTONE in error

The professors of law in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, collaborating on a "History of English Law before the Time of Edward I.," conjointly declare: "Blackstone's picture of a nation divided into two parties — 'the bishops and clergy' on the one side contending for their foreign jurisprudence; 'the nobility and the laity' on the other side adhering 'with equal pertinacity to the old common law' — is not a true one. It is by 'Popish clergymen' that our English law is converted from a rude mass of customs into an articulate system; and when the 'Popish clergymen,' yielding at length to the Pope's commands, no longer sit as the principal justices of the king's court, the golden age of the common law is over."

STOKES: The task of the Church

Frederick Stokes, in his Introduction to Maitland's "Dark Ages," thus sums up the

situation: "Almost every vestige of civilization had perished under the attacks of the Teutonic invaders. The work of founding a polity and a civilization had to be recommenced, and this is one of the salient facts to be borne in mind in judging of the Dark Ages. The men of those ages had to recreate the political and social world. They had to rebuild almost from the foundation. Not quite; for Christianity, the basis of European civilization, had not only survived the storms of the age of invasion, but had to a large extent converted the barbarians themselves."

HALLAM: What the Church did

"It was no crime of the clergy that the Huns burned their churches, or the Normans pillaged their monasteries. It was not by their means that the Saracens shut up the supply of papyrus, and that sheepskins bore a great price. Europe was altogether decayed in intellectual character, partly in consequence of the barbarian incursions, partly of other sinister influences, acting long before. We certainly owe to the Church every spark of learning which

then glimmered, and which she preserved through that darkness to rekindle the light of a happier age."

Hallam, Middle Ages, ch. ix. (Notes).

SCHLEGEL: Achievements of the time

"In the middle age, however, as in antiquity, the era of the foundation of states and nations, the era of legislation preceded that of the arts and of general refinement. . . . Of ignorance, however, and defective civilization, it is scarcely possible to accuse an age wherein the Mediterranean was covered with ships as richly laden, and its coasts by commercial cities as prosperous and powerful, as the most flourishing epoch of Greece . . . an age wherein architecture soared with a new flight and painting attained such high and hitherto unparalleled development and perfection; an age wherein philosophy almost too widely cultivated became an affair of state and practical life, wherein all the historical and literary knowledge which was at that time by any channels accessible was pursued with passionate eagerness and desire, when natural science and mathematics

were investigated and studied with untiring eagerness, until at last the two grand discoveries by which the mind of man attained its majority, the discovery of the new hemisphere and planetary motions, that is, of the true magnitude of the heaven and earth, crowned the research and labors of centuries."

Course of Lectures on Modern History, by Frederick Schlegel ; edition of Bohn's Library, London, 1849, Lectures 9 and 10, pp. 118–119.

HALLAM: Mediæval common schools

"The praise of having originally established schools belongs to some bishops and abbots of the sixth century. They came in place of the Imperial schools, overthrown by the barbarians. In the downfall of that temporal dominion, a spiritual aristocracy was providentially raised up, to save from extinction the remains of learning and of religion itself. Some of these schools seem to have been preserved in the south of Italy, though merely, perhaps, for elementary instruction. . . . The cathedral and conventual schools, created or restored by Charlemagne, became the means of pre-

serving that small portion of learning which continued to exist. They flourished most, having had time to produce their fruits, under his successors, Louis the Debonair, Lothaire, and Charles the Bald."

Hallam, Introd. to Lit. of Europe, vol. i. p. 27. New York: Harper Bros.

MAITLAND: Churchmen well read

"If the modern ecclesiastic should ever meet with a crop-eared monk of the tenth century, he may, if he pleases, laugh at him for not having read Virgil; but if he should himself be led to confess that, though a priest of Christ's Catholic church, and nourished in the languages of Greece and Rome till they were almost as familiar to him as his own, he had never read a single page of Chrysostom or Basil, of Augustine or Jerome, of Ambrose of Hilary — if he should confess this, I am of the opinion that the poor monk would cross himself, and make off without looking behind him."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 207. London: John Hodges, Pub., 1890.

FROUDE: The Mediæval clergy

"Never in all their history, in ancient times or modern, never that we know of, have mankind thrown out of themselves anything so grand, so useful, so beautiful as the Catholic church once was. . . . Wisdom, justice, self-denial, nobleness, purity, high-mindedness, — these are the qualities before which the free-minded races of Europe have been contented to bow; and in no order of men were such qualities to be found as they were found six hundred years ago in the clergy of the Catholic church."

James Anthony Froude, Lecture I. on the "Times of Luther and Erasmus" (Short Studies on Great Subjects, vol. i.).

BOSANQUET: An epoch of architecture

"We speak sometimes of the 'Dark Ages,' and in matters of the exact science perhaps they were dark enough. Yet we must deduct something from our youthful ideas of their obscurity when we find that our truest lovers of beauty fix the building-age of the world between the years 500 and 1500 of our era. Architecture, more than any other art, is an index to the

happiness and freedom of the people; and during this period of a thousand years an architecture pure in its principles, reasonable in its practice and beautiful to the eyes of all men, even the simplest, covered Europe with beautiful buildings from Constantinople to the north of Britain. In the presence of this manifestation of free and productive intelligence, unmatched even in ancient Greece and Rome, and utterly unmatchable to-day, we may usefully reflect upon the expressive and constructive force of Christendom, even in its darkest hours. The more closely we examine the question, the less ground we shall find for the conception of the middle ages as a long sleep followed by a sudden awakening. Rather we should consider that ancient Greece was the root, and ancient Rome the stem and branches of our life; that the Dark Ages, as we call them, represent its flower, and the modern word of science and political freedom the slowly matured fruit."

Bosanquet, The Civilization of Christendom, ch. iii.

FERGUSSON: Excellence of mediæval architecture

"Not even the great Pharaonic era in Egypt, the age of Pericles in Greece, nor the great period of the Roman Empire, will bear comparison with the thirteenth century in Europe, whether we look to the extent of the buildings executed, their wonderful variety and constructive elegance, the daring imagination that conceived them, or the power of poetry and of lofty religious feelings that is expressed in every feature and in every part of them."

Fergusson, History of Architecture.

HALLAM: An intellectual impulse in 1070

"About the latter part of the eleventh century a great ardor for intellectual pursuits began to show itself in Europe, which in the twelfth broke out into a flame. This was manifested in the numbers who repaired to the public academies or schools of philosophy."

Hallam, Middle Ages, ch. ix. p. 604.

DURUY: Greatness of the thirteenth century

"The most remarkable period of the middle ages is the thirteenth century.

Two great popes, Innocent III. and Innocent IV., then occupied the chair of St. Peter; a saint sat on the throne of France, and on that of the Empire a prince upon whom the gaze of the world has rested ever since, Frederick II. Italy temporarily regained her independence. England established her public liberties, wrote her great charter, instituted her parliament. The crusades failed; but the results of these great enterprises were still dazzlingly manifest. That great movement of men led to a great movement of things and ideas. Commerce, industry, letters, the arts advanced by leaps and bounds; schools multiplied; studies progressed; national literature was started; great names appeared: Albertus Magnus; Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, Dante."

History of France (ch. xv.) by Victor Duruy, Member of the French Academy. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

II

CHRISTIANITY AS A CIVILIZER

There was never found in any age of the world either philosophy, or sect, or religion, or law, or discipline, which did so highly exalt the good of the community, and increase private and particular good, as the holy Christian faith. — BACON.

THE moral forces in society were all throughout the middle ages engaged in a stupendous labor of regeneration.

1. In the pagan world slavery was an established and unquestioned condition. Plato made it the topic of eulogy in his "Republic." But all the instincts of Christianity were hostile to human bondage. "It is not ordained," protested St. Augustine, "that man should rule over man; his dominion is solely over brute creation." Reiterated by the canons of the Church and in the writings of her school-men, these ideas slowly but surely undermined the custom

of slavery. First by improving the condition of the slave, then by protecting his freedom when manumitted, and finally by making it a meritorious act to give freedom to serfs and to ransom captives, the Church accomplished a mighty stride in the path of human equality.

2. The elevation of woman proceeded on a similar principle. Marriage was made a sacrament, and chastity a virtue. Monogamy was prescribed; polygamy denounced. From being an inferior, the wife was raised to the position of a companion and an equal. So transcendent a change could have come only through powerful religious conviction.[1]

1 The place of honor assigned by the Church to the Virgin Mother of God, and the sanctity and protection given to nuns and pious women, under the teachings of the Church, silently but surely elevated the whole mediæval conception of woman. Mrs. Jameson says: "The protection and better education given to women in these early communities, the venerable and distinguished ranks assigned to them, when as governesses of their order they became in a manner dignitaries of the Church; the introduction of their beautiful and saintly effigies clothed with all the insignia of sanctity and authority into the places of worship and books of devotion, did more, perhaps, for the general cause of womanhood than all the boasted institutions of chivalry."

3. Chivalry was the efflorescence of this religious sentiment under the conditions of feudalism. Its cardinal principles were courage, gentleness of manner, and respect for sacred things. Undoubtedly it operated as a most potent solvent against barbarism and the attributes of the rude warrior.[1]

[1] The four qualities of true knighthood were valor, loyalty, courtesy, and munificence, that is, a disdain for money, and a disposition generously to relieve distress and reward service. Burke's description of chivalry is familiar; he speaks of it as "the unbought grace of life, the cheap defence of nations, the nurse of manly sentiment and heroic enterprise." "Never, nevermore," he says, "shall we behold that generous loyalty to rank and sex, that proud submission, that dignified obedience, that subordination of the heart, which kept alive even in servitude itself the spirit of an exalted freedom:" and he adds, "that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honor which felt a stain like a wound, which inspired courage whilst it mitigated ferocity, which ennobled whatever it touched, and under which vice itself lost half its evil by losing all its grossness."

"A very fascinating picture of chivalous manners has been drawn by a writer of considerable reading and still more considerable ability, Mr. Kenelm Digby, in his 'Broad Stone of Honor.' The bravery, the courteousness, the munificence, above all, the deeply religious character of knighthood and its reverence for the Church, naturally took hold of a heart so susceptible of these emotions, and a fancy so quick to embody them. St. Palaye himself is a less enthusiastic eulogist of chivalry,

4. The "Truce of God," originating in France about 1050, and spreading into Germany and England, was another device of the Church against the ferocity of the age. It was made ground for excommunication to do battle on four days of the week (Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday), corresponding with the passion and resurrection of Christ. Council after council reiterated this decree. A wonderful cessation of feudal strife and bloody knight errantry ensued as a consequence.

5. The establishment of trade unions, guilds, and corporations was one of the most progressive steps in the history of the middle ages.[1] Religion had much to do with

because he has seen it more on the side of mere romance, and been less penetrated with the conviction of its moral excellence." — Hallam, Middle Ages, part ii. ch. ix. page 597 (note).

[1] Referring to the trade corporations of the middle ages, Duruy says: "The members of a corporation obtained from it mutual protection, and aid for old men, widows, and orphans. Each had a patron saint, festivals, and a treasury. The chiefs prevented frauds and watched over the observance of the regulations. These regulations required a long and strict apprenticeship, and assured to the members of the corporation the monopoly of their industry; so that for each profession the number of masters was fixed by the corporation

these associations; they bore the names of saints and respected certain church holidays. Sandi, in his "Civil History of Venice," counts over sixty trade corporations in that city at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The Hanseatic League was modelled after religious communities, even to the extent of enjoining celibacy.

6. The influence of the Church was naturally exerted in favor of the poor and the decrepit.[1] Hospitals were placed by the secular governments under the charge of bishops and religious orders, and asylums were respected as Church property.

7. The mitigation of the criminal code, the restraint of tyranny, the protection of the weak as against the exactions of the strong, and the inculcation of gentle manners were direct consequences of Christian teachings. The Sermon on the Mount was the great text of the mediæval preacher;

itself. The result was that there was no competition, because there was no liberty, and prices were maintained at a high rate. But this severe discipline was necessary to an infant industry." (Duruy, History of France, ch. xv.)

[1] See Gasquet's Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries, vol. i. p. 107; vol. ii. pp. 95, 101.

and, indeed, no lessons were more in demand and of more wholesome effect.

FISHER: The Mediæval Church

"The Church of the middle ages I do not consider a mitigated evil, but an incalculable benefit to society. . . . Even the papacy, as is shown, was in the mediæval period in many respects a beneficial institution."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, prefatory note to 2d ed., 1883.

GIBBON: A salutary antidote

"The authority of the priests operated in the darker ages as a salutary antidote. They prevented the total extinction of letters, mitigated the fierceness of the times, sheltered the poor and defenceless, and preserved or restored the peace and order of civil society."

Gibbon, History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. lxi. (vol. vi. p. 230, Harper Bros. ed. 1880).

ADAMS: Fusion of races

"Here, then, is the work of the middle ages. To the results of ancient history were

to be added the ideas and institutions of the Germans, to the enfeebled Roman race was to be added the youthful energy and vigor of the German. Under the conditions which existed this union could not be made a harmonious and homogeneous Christendom, could not be formed, except through anarchy, ignorance, and superstition."

G. B. Adams, Civilization during the Middle Ages, Introd.

GUIZOT: Promoted peace

"She [the Church] combated with much pertinacity and perseverance the great vices of the social condition, particularly slavery. . . . The Church did not labor less worthily for the improvement of civil and criminal legislation. . . . Finally, she endeavored by every means in her power to suppress the frequent recourse which at this period was had to violence, and the continual wars to which society was so prone."

Guizot, History of Civilization, Lecture 6.

GUIZOT: The Church overcame barbarism

"No society ever made greater efforts than the Christian Church did from the

fifth to the tenth century to influence the world about it and to assimilate it to itself. When its history shall become the particular object of our examination, we shall more clearly see what it attempted. It attacked, in a manner, barbarism at every point in order to civilize it and rule over it."

Guizot, History of Civilization, vol. i. Lecture 3, p. 75.

MACAULAY: The Church abolished slavery

"Before the Reformation came, she [the Church] had enfranchised almost all the bondsmen in the Kingdom [England]."

Macaulay, History of England, vol. i. p. 33.

LECKY: Passing of the gladiator

"The extinction of the gladiatorial spectacle is, of all the results of early Christian influence, that upon which the historian can look with the deepest and most unmingled satisfaction."

Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 38 (D. Appleton & Co., 1877).

DURUY: Manifold work of the Church

"Before even thinking of constituting the State intelligently, it was necessary to elevate the individual and the family; this double task was the work of the middle ages. The Church worked at it energetically by establishing the sanctity of marriage, even for the serf; by preaching the equality of all men in the eyes of God; by proclaiming, through its maintenance of the principle of election, the rights of intelligence in the face of the feudal world which recognized only the rights of blood; by raising to the chair of St. Peter a serf like Adrian IV. or the son of a poor carpenter like Gregory VII."

History of France (p. 125), by Victor Duruy. New York: Crowell & Co., Publishers.

LECKY: The Church protected the people

"The relations of rulers to their subjects, and of tribunals to the poor, were modified by the intervention of the Church. When Antioch was threatened with destruction on account of its rebellion against Theodosius, the anchorites poured forth from the neigh-

boring deserts to intercede with the ministers of the Emperor, while Archbishop Flavian went himself as a suppliant to Rome. St. Ambrose imposed public penance on Theodosius on account of the massacre of Thessalonica. Synesius excommunicated for his oppression a governor named Andronicus; and two French councils, in the sixth century, imposed the same penalty on all great men who arbitrarily ejected the poor. St. Abraham, St. Epiphanius, and St. Basil are all said to have obtained the remission or reduction of oppressive imposts. To provide for the interest of the widows and orphans was part of the ecclesiastical duty, and a Council of Macon anathematized any ruler who brought them to trial without first apprising the Bishop of the diocese. A council of Toledo, in the fifth century, threatened with excommunication all who robbed priests, monks, or poor men, or refused to listen to their expostulations. . . . As time rolled on, charity assumed many forms, and every monastery became a centre from which it radiated. By the monks the nobles were overawed, the poor protected, the sick tended, travellers sheltered, prisoners

ransomed, the remotest spheres of suffering explored."

Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. ii. ch. iv. pp. 83–84 (ed. of D. Appleton & Co., 1877).

FISHER: Saved Europe from anarchy

"The feudal system was an atomic condition of political society. In this state of things the Church, through its hierarchical organization under one chief, did a beneficent work for civilization, by fusing the peoples, as far as its influence went, into a single community and subjecting them to a uniform condition. The mediæval papacy, whatever evils may have been connected with it, saved Europe from anarchy and lawlessness."

History of the Reformation, by George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Eccl. Hist. in Yale College, ch. ii. p. 32 (ed. of Chas. Scribner & Sons, 1883).

LECKY: Christian charity in the middle ages

"In no form of charity was the beneficial character of the Church more continually and more splendidly exercised than in redeeming captives from servitude. . . . St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great,

St. Cæsarius of Arles, St. Exuperius of Toulouse, St. Hilary, St. Remy, all melted down or sold their church vessels to free prisoners. St. Cyprian sent a large sum for the same purpose to the Bishop of Nicomedia. St. Epiphanus and St. Avitus, in conjunction with a rich Gaulish lady named Syagria, are said to have rescued thousands. St. Eloi devoted to this object his entire fortune. St. Paulinus of Nola displayed a similar generosity. . . . When, long afterward, the Mohammedan conquests in a measure reproduced the calamities of the barbarian invasions, the same unwearied charity was displayed. The Trinitarian monks, founded by St. John of Matha in the twelfth century, were devoted to the release of Christian captives, and another society [Our Lady of Mercy] was founded with the same object in view by St. Peter Nolasco in the following century."

Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. ii. ch. iv. pp. 73–74 (ed. of D. Appleton & Co., 1877).

FROUDE: The Church as a teacher

"Never, in all their history, in ancient times or modern, never, that we know of,

have mankind grown out of themselves anything so grand, so useful, so beautiful as the Catholic Church. In these times of ours, well-regulated selfishness is the recognized rule of action; every one of us is expected to look out for himself first and take care of his own interests. At the time I speak of, the Church ruled the State with the authority of a conscience, and self-interest, as a motive of action, was only named to be abhorred. The bishops and clergy were regarded freely and simply as the immediate ministers of the Almighty; and they seem to me to have really deserved that high estimate in their character. Wisdom, justice, self-denial, nobleness, purity, high-mindedness — these are the qualities before which the freeborn of Europe have been contented to bow; and in no order of men were such qualities found as they were found six hundred years ago in the clergy of the Catholic Church. They were allowed to rule because they deserved to rule, and in the fulness of reverence kings and nobles bent to their power, which was nearer to their own. Over prince and subject, chieftain and serf, a body of unarmed, defence-

less men reigned supreme by the magic of sanctity. They tamed the fiery Northern warriors who had broken in pieces the Roman empire. They taught them — they brought them really and truly to believe — that they had immortal souls, and that they would one day stand at the awful judgment bar, and give account of their lives there."

Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects (vol. i.), "Times of Erasmus and Luther," Lecture 1.

HALLAM: On chivalry

"The best school of moral discipline which the middle ages afforded was the institution of chivalry. . . . The spirit of chivalry left behind it a more valuable successor. The character of knight gradually subsided in that of gentleman; and the one distinguishes European society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as much as the other did in the preceding ages. A jealous sense of honor, less romantic but equally elevated; a ceremonious gallantry and politeness; a strictness in devotional observances; a high pride of birth, and feeling of independence of any sovereign

for the dignity it gave; a sympathy for martial honor, though more subdued by civil habits, — are the lineaments which prove an indisputable descent."

Hallam, Middle Ages, part ii. ch. ix.

III

"THE MONKS OF OLD"

I envy them, those monks of old,
Their books they read, their beads they told.
G. P. R. James

I like a church; I like a cowl;
I love a prophet of the soul;
And on my heart monastic aisles
Fall like sweet strains, or pensive smiles.
Emerson

WHATEVER view may now obtain respecting monasteries, there can be no doubt that "the monks of old" [1] enjoyed the average good opinion of their age. In times of violence the monastery lands were held inviolate; the monk

[1] St. Anthony (250–356) is regarded as the founder of monachism. In 529 St. Benedict re-organized monachism, and the Benedictine rule gradually prevailed in the monasteries all over western Europe. Waves of reform, such as those inaugurated at Cluny and Citteaux, transpired during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the thirteenth century the Dominicans and Franciscans appeared.

travelled without retinue. The avarice of the half-pagan nobility led to the suppression and spoliation of the rich monasteries at the time of the Reformation. But popular favor was still on the side of the monks. We have an instance of this in English history. In 1536 all the northern counties of England rose in rebellion at the suppression of the lesser monasteries. This uprising was known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace."

What are now called "the extinct virtues" — voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience — were the monastic vows chiefly insisted upon until the sixth century. Then St. Benedict added the requirement of manual labor, and among the rocks of Subiaco, forty miles from Rome, the foundations were laid for the monasticism of history.

1. The old monastic maxim which Carlyle so much admired, "Labor is prayer," naturally yielded marked results. The monks improved the rude agricultural science of their age, bringing to their tasks in the field the keenness of study and contemplation. Immense tracts of land in

the Hercynean woods, in the morasses of Holland, in the forests of Burgundy, and the fens of Lincolnshire, were caused to bloom as a garden by their labor. The most populous country in Europe to-day stretches between St. Omer and Liege. It was formerly a marsh, transformed by cowled and hooded tillers.

2. Cities and centres of population grew up about the fortresses of industry and peace established by monks. Under the shadow of the abbey, the husbandman was free from feudal rapacity. The etymology of such place-names as Munich is sufficiently significant.

3. The poor and weak were the especial solicitude of the mediæval monasteries. England's "poor laws" date from the suppression of the abbeys. Prior to that time, this social burden and duty was discharged by organized church agencies. "The monks," says Edmund Burke, "were the sole channel through which the bounty of the rich could reach the poor in any continued stream, and the people turned their eyes towards them in all distresses."

4. In times of barbarous forays, feudal

warfare and social violence, the peaceful, contemplative, and religious mind naturally sought a retreat for safety and kindred association. Weariness and adversity also craved a refuge. In this respect monasteries were an inevitable product of the age.

"O father abbot," says Wolsey in Shakespeare's play,

> "An old man broken by the storms of state
> Is come to lay his weary bones among you;
> Give him a little earth, for charity."

5. Some of the "great books" of the world were written in these mediæval retreats. "The Imitation of Christ" and the "Spiritual Combat" breathe of the solemn stillness and interior peace of monastic life. Our world may aspire to, but it can never quite realize, the contemplative spirit of those works.

6. The literature of antiquity was safely stored away in the monasteries until the period of the Renaissance. It was the labor of years to multiply the classical authors, but even in an age of manuscript books rich libraries were found in many abbeys. The thirty-two thousand manuscript books

in the great library at Paris are almost entirely in the handwriting of monks. The Bible was copied and illuminated, and the annals and chronicles of every country were for several centuries recorded solely by monks.

7. The schools of the middle ages were of monastic origin. The synods of the clergy and the capitularies of Charlemagne directed that schools should be opened in connection with the abbeys. Free common schools were an invention of the monks. The universities were a natural outgrowth. That of Paris, although springing from a small monastery school, had thirty thousand students in the time of Abelard. The majority of existing European universities date from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[1]

8. Quite naturally, minds educated in the monasteries began, eventually, to rule in the affairs of Church and State. Pope Gregory VII., called Hildebrand, came from

[1] The growth of Oxford and Cambridge universities in England synchronizes with "the coming of the friars." These were not monastic universities; nevertheless the monastic influence built them up.

the monastery of Cluny to work a great revolution in ecclesiastical polity. Peter the Hermit drew all Europe into the Crusades. Lanfranc, Roger Bacon, and Thomas Aquinas exerted influences of the most far-reaching character upon the thought and temper of their times.

9. Monopolizing the learning of the age, the monastery generally led the way in science and material progress. Alchemy, medicine, astronomy, geography, and other natural sciences were distinct tendencies of monastic studies in the fifteenth century. The numerous inventions made by monks — clocks, gunpowder, the musical scale, spectacles, etc. — are easily recalled.

10. One is impressed with the necessity of organized forces in the work of civilization and Christianization accomplished in the middle ages. There was an eternal fitness that the monasteries should undertake this mission. Fortresses of culture against barbarian invasions, they subsequently became centres from which missionaries issued forth to subjugate the world. A counter invasion was undertaken by surpliced monks in the very cradle of the Goths

and Vandals. They penetrated Russia and Scandinavia, and built their outposts in Iceland and Greenland.

Abuses, of course, crept in. Worldly-minded abbots were installed by the secular arm. Great wealth carried its inevitable temptations, and religion was disfigured by barbarism. But the sum total was progress, and the debt of society must be paid by a favorable and a liberal judgment.

FROUDE: The monastic system

"Let us now turn to another vast feature of the middle ages — I mean the monasteries. . . . The monks, as the brotherhoods were called, were organized in different orders with some variety of rule, but the broad principle was the same in all. They were to live for others, not for themselves. They took vows of poverty that they might not be entangled in the pursuit of money; they took vows of chastity, that the care of a family might not distract them from the work which they had undertaken. Their efforts of charity were not limited to this world. Their days were spent in hard bodily labor, in study, or in visiting the sick.

At night they were on the stone floors of their chapels, holding up their withered hands to heaven, interceding for the poor souls who were suffering in purgatory. The world, as it always will, paid honor to exceptional excellence. The system spread to the furthest limits of Christendom. . . . And gradually lands came to them, and wealth, and social dignity, — all gratefully extended to men who deserved well of their fellows; while no landlords were more popular than they, for the sanctity of the monks sheltered their dependents as well as themselves."

James Anthony Froude, Times of Erasmus and Luther (Short Studies on Great Subjects, vol. i. pp. 56–58, Longmans, Green, & Co., 1884).

MAITLAND: What the monasteries were

"It is impossible to get even a superficial knowledge of the mediæval history of Europe, without seeing how greatly the world of that period was indebted to the monastic orders; and feeling that, whether they were good or bad in other matters, monasteries were beyond all price in those days of misrule and turbulence, as places

where (it may be imperfectly, yet better than elsewhere) God was worshipped — as a quiet and religious refuge for helpless infancy and old age, a shelter of respectful sympathy for the orphan maiden and the desolate widow — as central points whence agriculture was to spread over bleak hills and barren downs and marshy plains, and deal bread to millions perishing with hunger and its pestilential train — as repositories of the learning which then was, and well-springs of the learning that was to be — as nurseries of art and science, giving the stimulus, the means, and the reward to invention, and aggregating around them every head that could devise and every hand that could execute — as the nucleus of the city which, in after days of pride, should crown its palaces and bulwarks with the towering cross of its cathedral."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 2 (John Hodges, Pub., London, 1890).

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: Monachism a deeply seated principle

"But the most philosophical mode of viewing its [monachism's] relation to Chris-

tianity is to recognize that monachism has made a part of every creed which has attained a certain stage of ethical and theosophical development; that there is a class of minds for which it always has had a powerful attraction, and which can otherwise find no satisfaction; and consequently, that Christianity, if it is to make good its claim to be a universal religion, must provide expression for a principle which is as deeply seated in human nature as domesticity itself, albeit limited to a much smaller section of mankind."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xvi. p. 698.

EMERTON: Monks led the age

"So we have, over and over again, great waves of monastic reform sweeping over European society, and carrying with them, let it be fairly understood, usually all that was best and most forward-looking in the community. The conclusion we have to draw from this fact is that the mediæval world was right; and it knew its own needs, and was trying to provide for them in its own way. Our business is, not to criticise these means of social improvement, but — and

this is far more difficult — to understand them."

Mediæval Europe, p. 558, by Ephraim Emerton, Prof. of History in Harvard University. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1894.

LECKY: Industrial advances led by the monks

"Here, again, the influence of the Church was exerted with unwavering beneficence and success. The fathers employed all their eloquence in favor of labor; but it is to the monks, and especially to the Benedictine monks, that the change is pre-eminently due. At a time when religious enthusiasm was directed towards the monastic life as towards the ideal of perfection, they made labor an essential part of their discipline. Wherever they went, they revived the traditions of old Roman agriculture, and large tracts of France and Belgium were drained and planted by their hands. The monks of the order of St. Basil devoted themselves especially to painting, and all the mediæval architects whose names have come down to us are said to have been ecclesiastics, till the rise of those great lay

companies who designed or built the cathedrals of the twelfth century. A great number of the towns of Belgium trace their origin in this manner to the monks. . . . By these means the contempt for labor which had been produced by slavery was corrected, and the path was open for the rise of the industrial classes which followed the crusades."

Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, vol. ii. pp. 231–232.

LECKY: Monks as builders

"In France, the low countries, and Germany they were pre-eminently agriculturists. Gigantic forests were felled, inhospitable marshes were reclaimed, barren plains cultivated by their hands. The monastery often became the nucleus of a city. It was the centre of civilization and industry, the symbol of moral power in an age of turbulence and war."

Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 184.

Hallam: Monasteries preserved books

"The monasteries were subjected to strict rules of discipline, and held out, at the worst,

more opportunities for study than the secular clergy possessed, and fewer for worldly dissipations. But their most important service was as secure repositories for books. All our manuscripts have been preserved in this manner, and could hardly have descended to us by any other channel; at least there were intervals when I do not conceive that any royal or private libraries existed."

Hallam, Middle Ages, ch. ix. part i. p. 484.

IV

THE PAPAL POWER

Then wakes the power which in the age of iron
Burst forth to curb the great, and raise the low.
Mark where she stands — around her form I draw
The awful circle of our solemn church.

BULWER LYTTON, *Richelieu*, IV. 2.

I. HILDEBRAND

THE Bishop of Rome was so much annoyed by Lombard free-booters, towards the middle of the eighth century, that he called upon Pepin, the French king, to come over the Alps and establish peace. When Pepin subdued the Lombards, he made the Pope sole ruler of Rome and the country near by.[1]

1 During the pontificate of Gregory I., known as Gregory the Great (590 to 604), the Pope gradually became the political ruler of Rome. Nominally, Rome was under the jurisdiction of the Exarchate of Ravenna, who was the representative of the emperor at Constanti-

This was a great advantage to the spiritual head of the Christian Church. It relieved him from the influence and annoyance of petty kings and princes. But the Papal office was not hereditary. The petty kings had an opportunity of stepping in at the death of the Pope and exercising considerable influence in selecting his successor. For their busy interference they claimed the privilege of appointing the bishops in their neighborhoods, and controlling the religious patronage. If they happened, as they frequently did, to be avaricious persons, there were scandalous sales of the best bishoprics and other unexemplary proceedings.

During the tenth century good men bitterly deplored the number of such abuses. Some of the Popes were appointed as the creatures of German emperors. Many important sees were filled by court favorites utterly unworthy of sacred offices.

The Church soon made a stupendous effort to free itself from such worldly vassal-

nople. [1] When Pepin came to Rome to repel the Lombards, he gave the entire Exarchate (extending east to the Adriatic) to the Pope.

age. It found a wise and adroit Moses in the monk Hildebrand.[1] His first step was to advise the Pope to designate a college of cardinals, which should thereafter have the naming of Roman pontiffs. Later on, Hildebrand was himself chosen Pope, and took the name of Gregory VII.

A ceremony called the "investiture" of bishops, or the conferring upon them of the ring and crosier of their office by the em-

[1] It is significant of the social power of the Church, that this man who defied kings was the son of a humble carpenter. Born in Tuscany A. D. 1013 and educated in Rome, he became a monk at the famous monastery of Cluny in France. He served a long apprenticeship in the work of the Church before he was called to the highest place in its government. He was virtually the adviser and counsellor of five of the Popes who preceded him, influencing them all towards measures which reformed and elevated the Church of the times. It was not until he had attained his sixtieth year that Hildebrand himself became Pope. When he died in exile (A. D. 1085) he said, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." Newman says: "Gregory thought he had failed: so it is; often a cause seems to decline as its champion grows in years, and to die in his death; but this is to judge hastily; others are destined to complete what he began. No man is given to see his work through. 'Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening,' but the evening falls before it is done." — Essays, Crit. and Hist., vol. ii. p. 316.

peror, had grown to mean more than a mere formality. The substance went with it; the actual selection of the bishop was implied in his investiture.[1] Henry IV. of Germany had been particularly insistent in his exercise of this prerogative. The Church was disgraced by the "bishops" thus thrust upon her.

Gregory VII. cut the Gordian knot by prohibiting the investiture and censuring any prince who kept it up.

The manner in which the emperor met this papal act illustrates his conception of the civil ruler's power. He called a meeting of his bishops and deposed Gregory from the papal office, not forgetting to set up one of his own court favorites in the former's place.

Gregory VII. saw that he must fight the devil with fire. His counterblast came at once (A. D. 1076) in a proclamation absolv-

[1] "The ring and crosier, it was asserted by the Papal advocates, were the emblems of that power which no monarch could bestow; but even if a less offensive symbol were adopted in investitures, the dignity of the Church was lowered, and her purity contaminated when her highest ministers were compelled to solicit the patronage or the approbation of laymen." — Hallam, Middle Ages, ch. vii. part i. p. 655.

ing the German people from allegiance to Henry. The ground taken was that the emperor had broken his coronation oath. That oath required him to protect the Church and respect his people's liberties. It happened that just then Henry was failing in both particulars. The act of Gregory met with a wonderful response. Everywhere the monks and friars denounced Henry as no longer fit to rule. The lords gathered and repudiated him. He was a king without a throne, and it became the highest policy on his part to repent.

This he did by a famous journey to Canossa. The Pope forgave him too easily, not discerning his purpose of revenge, for he subsequently drove Gregory from Rome, and the aged pontiff died in exile. But the Papal policy was fixed, and in the year 1122 the German emperor formally resigned the alleged right of "investiture." [1]

Gregory deposed Henry in self-defence; some of Gregory's successors kept up the war in Africa with the same object in view.

[1] This was by virtue of the famous "Concordat of Worms." Meanwhile Henry V. had succeeded his father as emperor of Germany.

A great contest with Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany, was ended in 1177. The Papal authority won again. A few years afterwards King John of England asked the Pope to order the French king to give Normandy back to Britain, — implying that authority for such an act resided in the Roman See. Innocent III. did not do so, but he afterwards found occasion to declare John's throne forfeited, and to absolve the English from their allegiance.

II. THE DEPOSING POWER

For two centuries following Hildebrand's struggle with Henry IV. it seems to have been the generally received opinion that the Pope might depose sovereigns where such valid reasons existed as oppression of the people, heresy, and vice. The precise basis of this opinion is not clear. Some regard it as a development of feudalism, the Pope being recognized as the suzerain of all the sovereigns of Christendom. As a matter of fact, many rulers, at different times, placed their dominions under the direction of the Pope, or invoked the papal authority to

recover their possessions. The deposing power may also have developed from a disposition to regard the Pope as the arbiter in disputes between Christian rulers. Still another view regards the deposing power as the received public law of the middle ages — from the fact that Kings and Emperors in order to reign lawfully had to profess the Catholic faith and be in communion with the Pope. Fénelon found a basis for the deposing power in the fact that the Pope was the final judge of all political contracts involving "allegiance." He, as the chief pastor of the Church, was bound, in disputed cases, to instruct people consulting him as to whether they were obliged to keep their oaths of fealty.

It seems clear that the deposing power of the Pope never was, and is not now, regarded as an article of Catholic faith. Pius IX. in a sermon quoted by Cardinal Soglia, said: "No one now thinks any more of the right of deposing princes, which the Holy See formerly exercised, and the supreme pontiff even less than any one." [1]

[1] Ferraris, *Papa*, quoted in Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary.

It was a species of international law which the events of history, religious and political upheavals, have practically abrogated. But while it was exercised, and during the ages when people recognized it, it undoubtedly served to promote liberty and to curb the cruelty and cupidity of sovereigns.

In our age the people do almost every year what the Popes did but rarely. The breed of kings has improved; there were numbers of mediæval monarchs who ought to have been deposed, but who were let alone. The Papal anathemas struck men like Henry IV. and John Lackland, who richly deserved the scaffold.

III. MORAL CHARACTER OF THE POPES

Of the two hundred and sixty Popes, seventy-nine have been canonized by the Catholic Church as saints, pre-eminent for their holiness.

Some fifteen or twenty of the remainder have been variously accused of immorality, political ambition, and criminal intrigue. It is noteworthy that the characters of several

thus accused have been vindicated by Protestant biographers. Voigt, in his Life of Gregory VII., Hurter's Innocent III., Eichhorn, Luden, Mueller, and Leopold Ranke have cleared up much fiction and partisan tradition reflecting upon the moral character of a dozen Pontiffs.

An instance of the absurdity of some of these fables is found in the story of Pope Joan. A learned woman, disguised as a man, succeeded, so the narrative runs, in deceiving the churchmen and securing her own selection to the Papal throne, which she occupied for nearly three years. This story is traced back to within two hundred years of the alleged date of the female Pope's pontificate. It is found wanting in a single element of authenticity, and no modern historian gives it any credence.[1]

The tenth century furnishes us the most certain instances of immoral or bad Popes. Society was then in a transitional state. Rome was described as the "hostelry of nations." The "bad Popes" are variously estimated by Catholic writers as from six to twenty. "We have forty-three virtuous,

[1] See Baring-Gould's Myths of the Middle Ages.

to one bad pope," says Cardinal Gibbons (Faith of our Fathers, chap. xi.), "while there was a Judas Iscariot among the twelve Apostles."

Writers like Leopold Ranke (History of the Popes) describe the Roman Pontiffs of the first ages and of later times (since the rise of Protestantism) as irreproachable in their moral characters. Voigt (Gregory VII., vol. ii. p. 98) says: "The Holy See was the only tribunal that could set any limits to imperial despotism as a second defender of humanity." Roscoe (Life of Leo X., vol. i. p. 53) says: "The Popes may in general be considered as superior to the age in which they lived."

FISHER: The mediæval papacy

"The mediæval papacy, whatever evils may have been connected with it, saved Europe from anarchy and lawlessness."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. ii. p. 32.

Lilly: Hildebrand an apostle of liberty

"Gregory (VII.) was the savior of political freedom too. He was the founder of

communal liberty in Italy, the apostle of Italian independence."

W. S. Lilly, Chapters in European History, vol. i. p. 183.

SOUTHEY: The savior of Europe

"If the Papal power had not been adapted to the conditions of Europe, it could not have subsisted. It was the remedy for some of the greatest evils. We have to look to the Abyssinians and Oriental Christians, to see what Europe would have become without the Papacy. It was morally and intellectually the conservative power of Christendom. Politically, it was the savior of Europe. For, in all probability, the West, like the East, must have been overrun by Mohammedanism, and sunk in irredeemable degradation if, in that great crisis of the world, the Church had not roused the nations to a united and prodigious effort commensurate with the danger. In the frightful state of society which sometimes prevailed, the Church everywhere presented a controlling and remedial influence."

Southey, Book of the Church.

WHEATON: Papal authority a blessing

"The influence of the Papal authority, though sometimes abused, was then felt as a blessing to mankind; it rescued Europe from total barbarism; it afforded the only asylum and refuge from feudal oppression."

Wheaton, History of the Laws of Nations, p. 33.

COMTE: A basis of judgment

"The papal hierarchy," says Comte, "in fact, constituted, in the middle ages, the main bond among the various European nations, after the decline of the Roman sway; and in this view the Catholic influence ought to be judged, as De Maistre truly remarked, not only by the ostensible good which it produced, but yet more by the imminent evil which it silently obviated, and which, on that account, we can only inadequately appreciate."

GUIZOT: The Papacy and liberty

"When a pope or bishop proclaimed that a sovereign had lost his rights, that his subjects were released from their oath of fidelity, this interference, though undoubtedly

liable to the greatest abuse, was often, in the particular case to which it was directed, just and salutary. It generally holds, indeed, that where liberty is wanting religion, in a great measure, supplies its place. In the tenth century the oppressed nations were not in a state to protect themselves or to defend their rights against civil violence — religion, in the name of Heaven, placed itself between them."

Guizot, History of Civilization, vol. i. Lecture 5, p. 124, 3d Am. ed. (Hazlitt's Notes).

COQUEREL: Despotism prevented

"In those 'dark' ages we see no example of tyranny comparable to that of the Domitians at Rome. A Tiberius was impossible then; Rome would have crushed him. Great despotisms exist when kings believe that there is nothing above themselves. Then it is that the intoxication of unlimited power produces the most fearful crimes."

Coquerel, Essai sur l'Hist. Générale du Christianisme, p. 75.

ROBERTSON: A real benefit

"The Pontifical monarchy taught the nations and kings to regard themselves mutually as compatriots, as being both equally subject to the divine sceptre of religion; and this centre of religious unity has been throughout many ages a real benefit to the human race."

Robertson, Charles V.

SISMONDI: The Pope defender of the people

"In the midst of the conflicts of jurisdictions, the Pope alone proved to be the defender of the people, the only pacifier of great disturbances. The conduct of the Pontiffs inspired respect, as their beneficence merited gratitude."

Sismondi, History of the Italian Republics.

LEIBNITZ: Hindered many evils

"It must be confessed that the solicitude of the Popes concerning the canons and Ecclesiastical discipline, was from time to time most beneficial; and that, by influencing kings, in season and out of season, either by the authority of their office or by

the threat of ecclesiastical censures, the Pontiffs hindered many evils. And nothing was more common than that kings should subject themselves, in their treaties, to the censure and correction of the Pope, as in the treaty of Bretigny in 1360, and in the treaty of Etaples in 1492."

Leibnitz, De actorum publicorum usu.

LEIBNITZ: The Pope as umpire among the nations

"If all would become Catholics and believe in the infallibility of the Pope, there would not be required any other umpire than that of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. If the Popes resumed the authority which they had in the time of Nicholas the First or Gregory the Seventh, it would be the means of obtaining perpetual peace and conducting us back to the golden age."

Leibnitz, Id.

LECKY: Popes who saved Rome

"But everywhere amid this chaos of dissolution we may detect the majestic form of the Christian priest mediating between the hostile forces, straining every nerve to

lighten the calamities around him. When the Imperial city was captured and plundered by the hosts of Alaric, a Christian church remained a secure sanctuary, which neither the passions nor the avarice of the Goths transgressed. When a fiercer than Alaric had marked out Rome for his prey, the Pope St. Leo, arrayed in his sacerdotal robes, confronted the victorious Hun, as the ambassador of his fellow-countrymen, and Attila, overpowered by religious awe, turned aside in his course. When, twelve years later, Rome lay at the mercy of Genseric, the same Pope interposed with the Vandal conqueror, and obtained from him a partial cessation of the massacre."

Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. ii. ch. iv.

PALGRAVE: A Pope's moral courage

"Hildebrand, sparing neither the bribed nor the bribers, incurred the inveterate odium of all the delinquents. Hildebrand had no respect to persons or judgment. Sin levelled emperors and beggars before him."

Sir Francis Palgrave, History of Normandy and England, vol. i. p. 112.

SCHLEGEL: Origin of the Papal power

"Hence the high authority which Rome then exercised over kings and emperors was grounded, first, on a political claim growing out of the circumstances which accompanied the revival of the western empire; and secondly, on the general opinion of that time respecting the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power."

Schlegel, Philos. of Hist., p. 137.

LINGARD: Kings appealed to the Pope

"This doctrine, hostile as it might be to the independence of sovereigns, was often supported by the sovereigns themselves. Thus, when Richard I. was held in captivity by the emperor, his mother, Eleanor, repeatedly solicited the Pontiff to procure his liberation by the exercise of that authority which he possessed over all temporal princes. Thus, King John Lackland (whose excesses afterwards provoked against himself the animadversion of the Church) invoked the aid of the same authority to recover Normandy from the King of France. At first, indeed, the Popes contented them-

selves with spiritual censures; but in an age when all notions of justice were modelled after the feudal jurisprudence, it was soon admitted that princes, by their disobedience, became traitors to God; that as traitors they ought to forfeit their kingdoms, the fees which they held of God; and that to pronounce such sentence belonged to the Pontiff, vicegerent of Christ upon earth."

Lingard, History of England, vol. iii. of the 3d London ed., p. 35, note.

SCHLEGEL: A voice against despotism

"By the princes themselves was the head of the Church first called upon to decide weighty matters of state and to exert influence over the affairs of Europe. . . . We cannot deny, on examining closely the wants of the situation and the spirit of those times, that it accomplished much good; that not seldom it protected the oppressed cause of justice. . . . It seemed desirable and wholesome that even against the mightiest rulers one voice dared still to be raised alone for justice — a voice of which he should stand

in awe; which he could not silence by mere force."

A Course of Lectures on Modern History, by Frederic Schlegel, Bohn's Popular Library, London, 1849, Lectures 6–7, p. 88.

V

THE CRUSADES

Then blame not those who, by the mightiest lever
Known to the moral world, imagination,
Upheave (so seems it) from her natural station
All Christendom; — they sweep along (was never
So huge a host) to tear from the unbeliever
The precious tombs, their haven of salvation.

WORDSWORTH

RELIGIOUS fervor and devotion were not the only causes of those onslaughts of United Europe against Mohammedan Asia, called the Crusades. The immediate purpose was to protect the liberty and life of Christian pilgrims visiting Jerusalem. There was a continuous breach of international rights in this respect, to redress which, any spirited modern nation would take up the sword. But the deep, underlying motive was the apprehension of Christian Europe for its own safety.

"Mussulman impiety," said the contemporaneous Pope Urban II.,[1] "has overspread the fairest regions of Asia; Ephesus, Nice, and Antioch have become Mohammedan cities; the barbarous hordes of the Turks have planted their colors on the very shores of the Hellespont, whence they threaten war to all our states of Christendom. Unless you oppose a mighty barrier to their triumphant course, how can Europe be saved from invasion, how can the storm be averted which has so long threatened to burst upon our countries?"[2]

With Christian civilization it was a war of self-preservation.

1. In this respect the Crusades were a notable success. Instead of waiting, as disunited states, to receive the blow of Mohammedan invasion, the nations of Europe "took time by the forelock," welded themselves into unity, and made the aggressive move themselves. The Saracens and Selju-

[1] He addressed a great council at Piacenza, in 1095, at which two hundred bishops and nearly four thousand priests were present.

[2] Michaud, History of the Crusades, vol. i. Michaud's work continues (despite some errors) to be the great standard authority on the Crusades.

kians were beaten to the ground. The issue for supremacy was inevitable between the religion born at Galilee and that born at Mecca. Rome saw farthest ahead.[1]

The first (A. D. 1090), fifth (A. D. 1201), and sixth (A. D. 1228) Crusades were the most important, at least in their results.

In 1099 the first Crusaders captured Jerusalem and set up a Christian kingdom there which lasted eighty-eight years. In 1205 a Latin empire was established in place of the Greek empire at Constantinople, and the Eastern schism appeared to be at an end. But this union of the Eastern and Western churches lasted only until 1261, when the Latin empire was overthrown. Jerusalem again came into the possession of the Christians by treaty in 1229 (as a result of the sixth Crusade), but in 1242 the hordes of Jenghiz Khan again swept away the Christian dominion; nor did the subsequent Crusaders ever get as far as the Holy City. The last or ninth Crusade went out, A. D. 1270, under St. Louis, King of France.

[1] It is in this connection that Cardinal Newman remarks that those who in our time speak so bravely against the Pope owe it to the Pope that they can speak at all.

Nazareth was taken, but there the enterprise ended.[1]

2. From the East the returning Crusaders brought back new inventions, new fabrics like the silk manufacture, alchemy, the Arabic notation, and all the impetus to science and letters that came from contact with Syria, Greece, and other strange lands.[2] In the history of civilization this alone was sufficient to compensate for the blood and treasure expended in these movements.

3. The Crusades were a blow at feudalism, cutting off the petty nobility and securing more orderly government. Travelling became easier. The enfranchised boroughs and the free cities sprang up by reason of the Crusades.

4. The art of navigation was improved in the transport of armies. Nations built

[1] It is estimated that nearly two million people lost their lives in the two centuries of the Crusades. The cessation of private warfare at home nearly counterbalanced this loss.

[2] However beneficial attrition with other civilizations proved, we must not fall into the error of those who, in their eagerness to disparage Christianity, imagine that Moorish or Saracen civilization was superior to the Christian civilization of the middle ages.

navies. The mariner's compass was brought into use.

5. And from this circumstance came the growth of commerce and the upbuilding of Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Florence, those great mediæval marts whose trade with Asia and Africa was of world-wide note, and whose population of bankers and merchants laid the foundation of our modern commercial law as we read it.

Thus a movement undertaken in what to materialists seems a spirit of fanaticism and superstition, justified itself even in their eyes by promoting Europe's material growth.

BISHOP STUBBS: The Crusades a benefit to society

"The Crusades are not, in my mind, either the popular delusions that our cheap literature has determined them to be, nor Papal conspiracies against kings and peoples, as they appear to the Protestant controversialist. . . . They were the first great effort of mediæval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambition; they were the trial feat of the young world essaying to use, to the glory of God and the

benefit of man, the arms of its new knighthood. . . . That in the end they were a benefit to the world no one that reads can doubt; and that in their course they brought out a love for all that is heroic in human nature — the love of freedom, the honor of prowess, sympathy with sorrow, perseverance to the last, and patient endurance without hope, — the chronicles of the age abundantly prove; proving moreover that it was by the experience of those times that the former of these virtues were realized and presented to posterity."

Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History, p. 157, by Wm. Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Chester, Regius Prof. of Modern History at Cambridge and Edinburgh. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1885.

ADAMS: A universal stimulus

"The Crusades had a most profound effect on the people of Europe. The age was one of great stir and stimulus. Mind was aroused. The crusaders were brought into contact with better civilization than their own and were taught that they had many things yet to learn. Before the age of the Crusades had closed, and produced at least

in part by them, there occurs the great intellectual epoch of the thirteenth century which created the scholastic system in philosophy and founded the universities of Europe. . . . An even more immediate effect of the Crusades was the stimulus which they gave to commerce, and the changes which followed in this direction were as far reaching and profound as the intellectual."

European History, p. 217, by Geo. B. Adams, Professor of History in Yale University. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH: Moral effects

"Such a purpose and aim was the Crusades, during well-nigh two centuries, for Europe; and the answer which Christian Europe made to the appeal is a signal testimony of the preparedness of the middle ages for noble thoughts and noble deeds. To the high thoughts which they kindled in so many hearts, to the religious consecration which they gave to the bearing of arms, we are indebted for some of the fairest aspects of chivalry, as it lives on a potent and elevating tradition to the present day. Thus to them we owe the stately

courtesies of gallant foes able to understand and to respect one another, with much else which has lifted up modern warfare into something better than a mere mutual butchery, even into a school of honor in which some of the gentlest and noblest men have been trained."

Archbishop Trench, Lectures on Mediæval Church History.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: Arrested Mohammedanism

"They [the Crusades] failed, indeed, to establish the permanent dominion of Latin Christendom, whether in New Rome or Jerusalem, but they prolonged, for nearly four centuries, the life of the Eastern Empire, and by so doing they arrested the tide of Mohammedan conquests as effectually as it was arrested for Western Europe by Charles Martel on the plains of Tours."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., article "Crusades," vol. vi. p. 629.

Cox: Crusades saved Europe

"We must not forget that by rolling back the tide of Mohammedan conquest

from Constantinople for upward of four centuries they [the Crusades] probably saved Europe from horrors the recital of which might even now make one's ears tingle."

G. W. Cox, The Crusaders, ch. xv. p. 224.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: Economic effects

"The Crusades undoubtedly produced a powerful economic effect by transferring, in many cases, the possessions of the feudal chiefs to the industrious classes, whilst, by bringing different nations and races into contact, by enlarging the horizon and the conception of the populations, as by affording special stimulus to navigation, they tended to give a new activity to international trade."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xix. p. 352.

GUIZOT: Enlarged the ideas of Europe

"The principal effect, then, of the Crusades was a great step towards the emancipation of the mind, a great progress towards enlarged and liberal ideas. . . . Such, in my opinion, are the real results of

the Crusades, — on the one hand extension of ideas and the emancipation of thought, on the other a general enlargement of the social sphere and the opening of a wider field for every sort of activity: they produced at the same time more individual freedom and more political unity."

Guizot, History of Civilization, vol. i. Lecture 8.

LA CROIX: Developed commerce

"The effect of the Crusades was, nevertheless, a complete revolution in the manners and customs of the western nations: the suppression of servitude, the founding of the free towns, the alienation and the division of the feudal laws and the development of the commercial system."

Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages, p. 134, by Paul La Croix, Curator of the Imperial Library of the Arsenal, Paris. London: Chapman and Hall, 1874.

ROBERTSON: Promoted chivalry

"The same spirit of enterprise which had prompted so many gentlemen to take arms in defence of the oppressed pilgrims of Palestine, incited others to declare them-

selves the patrons and avengers of injured innocence at home. When the final reduction of the Holy Land under the dominion of infidels put an end to these foreign expeditions, the latter was the only employment left for the activity and courage of adventurers. To check the insolence of overgrown oppressors; to rescue the helpless from captivity; to protect or to avenge women, orphans, and ecclesiastics, who could not bear arms in their own defence; to redress wrongs and remove grievances — were deemed acts of the highest prowess and merit. Valor, humanity, courtesy, justice, honor, were the characteristic qualities of chivalry."

William Robertson, History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V.

VI

PREMATURE PROTESTANTISMS

I would rather die ten times over than make a schism. — ERASMUS.

IT is worthy of remark that six of the earlier heresies in the history of the Church should have arisen respecting the divine persons of the Godhead. The Arians (325) taught that Christ was inferior to the other persons of the Trinity.[1] The Macedonians (381) taught that the Holy Ghost was inferior. The Nestorians (431) taught that there were *two persons* (not two natures) in Christ. The Eutychians (451) taught that there was but *one*

[1] The Arians constituted by far the most considerable heresy of the early ages. Arius died in 336, but Arianism prospered after his death. The West Goths received Christianity in the Arian form, and the East Goths and Lombards also were Arians. This heresy dominated Spain and Africa and Northern Italy for more than a hundred years, nor did it decline until the end of the sixth century.

nature — the divine. The Monothelites (680) held that Christ had no human will. The Manichæans (280 – 1215) taught that Christ did not assume a *real* human body, but merely appeared in one, like the angels of the Old Testament.

The Pelagian heresy denied the doctrine of original sin. The Iconoclasts opposed sacred images. And the heresy of Berengarius (1078) denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

During the latter middle ages the most famous heresies were those of the Albigenses and Waldenses, condemned by the Council of Lateran in 1179; and the teachings of Wycliffe and his disciple, Huss, condemned by the Council of Constance in 1414.

These may be styled *premature Protestantisms*, from the fact that they expressed the religious unrest of their time. The Calvinists were proud to trace their ancestry to the Waldenses, and Wycliffe is sometimes styled the prototype of English Protestantism.

The Albigenses were so styled after Albi, a town in southern France, where the sect

became numerous about 1200. Pope Innocent III. sent Peter, of Château-neuf, and three other monks to convert them; but they murdered Peter and terrified his followers. Count Raymond of Toulouse sided with them, and they carried things with a high hand. The murder of the Pope's legate was the occasion of a crusade against Toulouse and Albi, led by Simon of Montfort, at the head of a French army. The war[1] lasted intermittently from 1209 to 1227, and finally drifted from a religious to a political contest. The Albigenses were utterly crushed.

Respecting the nature of the Albigensian teachings, contemporary writers agree in connecting them with the Manichæans.

This, too, is Bossuet's opinion. Hallam and Mosheim substantially coincide with him. Identification with Manichæism is regarded as a damning indictment against the Albigenses. The judicial records of the

[1] The battle of Murret (1213) decided the war against the Albigenses. Raymond of Toulouse was then deposed, and Simon de Montfort, who had led the Crusaders, and whose son figures as the founder of the English Parliament, was given the fiefs that formerly belonged to Raymond.

middle ages are full of the blackest crimes attributed to this sinuous and surreptitious sect.

Mani, a Persian teacher of the third century, compounded Paganism and Christianity into a system of doctrines, which persisted through the centuries in various forms and under various names. One author counts over seventy Manichæan sects.

The popular and legal dislike towards the Manichæans was due, not so much to their theological vagaries as to their reputed immoralities. They were described as Mediæval Mormons. They inculcated devil-worship, denied the divinity of Christ, rejected the Old Testament, and repudiated the observance of Sunday.

Their midnight orgies, their hatred of marriage, their incests, fornications, and suicides were the scandals of the middle ages. They united secrecy and hypocrisy as methods of covering their tracks.

In France they were called, from their origin, Bulgarians; in some parts of Italy, Publicans, a corruption of the word Paulicians; in the provinces, where they were

most numerous, Provincials, or, after 1208, Albigenses, from the town of Albi in Languedoc; in the Milanese Territory, Cathari, *i. e.*, the Pure, or Paterenes and Paterinians, a name which they had usurped from the anti-simoniacal Catholic Church party in Milan; in Belgium, Piphiler or Weavers, from the trade which the greater number of them followed, and sundry other names; but the generic term, Manichæans, was given to them universally, and was accepted by themselves in their disputations with Catholics.

The Albigenses held many of the Manichæan doctrines and rivalled them in many points of violence and debauchery. "I have seen on all sides," says Stephen, Abbot of St. Genevieve, describing to the King of France the condition of Albigensian Toulouse, "churches burned and ruined to their foundations; I have seen the dwellings of men changed into the dens of wild beasts."

The Waldenses, who were also termed Vaudois and Poor Men of Lyons, were followers of Peter Waldo, a merchant of Lyons.

In 1160 Waldo, affected by the death of a fellow merchant, gave his property to the poor, and led a life of poverty. In teaching that malefactors ought not to be condemned, but should be allowed to go at large, — after the manner of the tares described in the parable, — the Waldenses came into conflict with the civil power. They denounced oaths as sinful, and advocated Communism. The Mass and Purgatory were eliminated from their religion. They thought the clergy ought to hold no property. Ultimately some of them drifted into the immoral and pagan customs of the Albigenses. The fact that they existed about the time and in the neighborhood of the Albigenses has led to their being confounded with these more unworthy sectaries.

The heresies of Wycliffe (1324–84) and John Huss (1375–1414) bore fruits in the Lollards of England and the Bohemian Brethren of Prague. Henry V. put down the former on the charge of conspiracy, and the Bohemian Brethren, after a bloody civil war, expired of inanition.

Wycliffe continued a priest of the Catholic

Church to the time of his death. His divergence from Catholic teaching had reference to the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters, which he partly controverted, and to certain regulations respecting the authority of Bishops over priests. He seems to have recanted his views prior to his death.

Huss followed Wycliffe in most points, but was more violent in his methods. He attended the Council of Constance under a safe conduct from the Emperor Sigismund. The council condemned his teachings as heretical, and heresy being at that time a violation of the civil as well as the ecclesiastical law, the secular arm took hold of Huss after the council had got through with him. He was burned at the stake July, 1414.

HALLAM: The Albigenses were Manichæans

"The tenets ascribed to them [the Albigenses] by all contemporary authorities coincide so remarkably with those held by the Paulicians, and in earlier times by the Manichæans, that I do not see how we can reasonably deny what is confirmed by sepa-

rate and uncontradicted testimonies, and contains no intrinsic want of probability."

Hallam, View of the Middle Ages, ch. ix. part ii.

MILMAN: Adverse to Christian morals

"Western Manichæism, however, though it adhered only to the broader principles of Orientalism, the two co-equal conflicting principles of good and evil, the eternity of matter, and its implacable hostility to spirit, aversion to the Old Testament as the work of the wicked Demiurge, the unreality of the suffering Christ, was, or became, more Manichæan than its Grecian parent, Paulicianism. . . . Western Manichæism is but dimly to be detected in the eleventh century. . . . But in the twelfth century Manichæism is rampant, bold, undisguised. Everywhere are Puritans, Paterines, Populars, suspected, or convicted, or confessed Manichæans. . . . The chief seat of these opinions was in the south of France. . . . Their religion was chivalry, but chivalry becoming less and less religious; the mistress had become the saint, the casuistry of the Court of Love superseded that of the confessional. There had grown up a gay

license of manner adverse not only to the austerity of monkish Christianity but to pure Christian morals."

Henry Hart Milman, History of Latin Christianity, vol. v. ch. viii. pp. 159–163. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1861.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: Their creed

"The descent of the Albigenses may be traced with tolerable distinctness from the Paulicians, a sect that sprang into existence in the Eastern Church during the sixth century. The Paulicians were agnostics, and were accused by their enemies and persecutors of holding Manichæan doctrines which, it is said, they vehemently disowned. Their creed, whatever it may have been precisely, spread gradually westward through Europe. In the ninth century it found many adherents in Bulgaria, and three hundred years later it was maintained and defended, though not without important modifications, by the Albigenses in the south of France. . . . They [the Albigenses] inherited and used, as has already been said, certain doctrines of eastern origin, such as the Manichæan dualism, diocetism in relation

to the persons of Christ, and a theory of metempsychosis. They seem, like the Manichæans, to have disowned the authority of the Old Testament; and the division of their adherents into the *perfecti* and *credentes* is similar to the Manichæan distinction between *electi* and *auditori*."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. i. p. 454.

MILMAN: Manichæan opinion in the twelfth century

"Nothing is more curious in Christian history than the vitality of the Manichæan opinions. That wild, half-poetic, half-rationalistic theory of Christianity appears almost suddenly in the twelfth century, in living, almost irresistible power, first in its intermediate settlement in Bulgaria, and on the borders of the Greek Empire, then in Italy, in France, in Germany, in the remote West at the foot of the Pyrenees. The chief seat of these opinions was in the south of France."

H. H. Milman, History of Latin Christianity, book ix. ch. viii.

SCHAFF-HERZOG: Their violence

"In a short time the Albigenses had congregations with schools and charitable institutions of their own. Then they drove away the Roman Catholic priests from the churches, took possession of the buildings, and elected their own priests and bishops. . . . This state of things caused, of course, great alarm at Rome."

The Schaff-Herzog Dictionary, vol. i., article on Albigenses.

STEPHEN: Albigensian immoralities

"The imputations of irreligious heresy and shameless debauchery, which have been cast with so much bitterness on the Albigenses by their persecutors, and which have been so zealously denied by their apologists, are probably not ill-founded, if the word Albigenses be employed as synonymous with the words Provenceaux or Languedocians, for they were apparently a race among whom the hallowed charities of domestic life, and the reverence due to divine ordinances and the homage due to divine truth, were often impaired, and not seldom extin-

guished by ribald jests, by infidel scoffing, and by heart-hardening impurities. Like other voluptuaries, the Provenceaux (as their remaining literature attests) were accustomed to find matter for merriment in vices which would have moved wise men to tears."

Sir J. Stephen, Lectures on the History of France, Lecture 7.

VII

SAVONAROLA

They never fail who die
In a great cause. The block may soak their gore,
Their heads may sodden in the sun, their limbs
Be strung to city gates and castle walls;
But still their spirit walks abroad.

BYRON.

ABOUT the time that Columbus was setting out on his first voyage of discovery (1492), a Dominican friar, Jerome Savonarola, forty years of age, was rising into fame as a moral and political leader at Florence.

His influence began as a pulpit orator and a moral reformer. In the course of events he became a law-giver to the people of Florence, a virtual dictator over the politics as well as the morals of the city; and then, towards the years of his downfall, the victim of a bitter partisan struggle. Six short years (1492–98) saw him first the

idol of the people and afterward done to death under a cloud of popular infamy by the same fickle populace who had once idolized him and whom he had so greatly served.

He had come to Florence in 1482; but it was not until seven years later that he began to acquire fame as a preacher in that city. His sermons were jeremiads, denouncing and lamenting the vices of the age, and predicting the dire punishments which God had in store for Florence. He did not spare the rulers, either of church or state. Lorenzo de' Medici was then the the autocrat of Florence, where the Medicis had ruled for half a century. Savonarola was uncompromising in his opposition to Lorenzo. The latter induced an Augustinian friar, Mariano, to attack Savonarola. Mariano was discomfited; and, later, retired to Rome, where his bitter enmity to Savonarola continued. Lorenzo died in 1492 and was succeeded by his son Piero. The moral and political condition of Florence continued to degenerate under Piero de' Medici. As a result, the influence and power of Savonarola, as a censor of the evil moral

condition of the city, increased. He became prior of St. Mark's, and his ecclesiastical jurisdiction was made an independent one.

In 1494 Charles VIII. of France invaded Italy with 60,000 men. Calamity and misery followed his march. Savonarola went at the head of a delegation of Florentines to meet the French king at Pisa. In the mean time the Florentines expelled Piero de' Medici. Largely through the influence of Savonarola, the visit of the French was not as disastrous as it might have been. A new government was set up at Florence which was nominally a republic. Savonarola was now by common consent the law-giver to his people as well as the moral censor of the city. The years 1494–97 were, more or less, years of a rigorous puritanism for the people of Florence.

A reaction was inevitable. Savonarola's denunciations had offended Pope Alexander VI. The expelled Medici were his enemies. The young bloods of Florence bridled under his rigorous morality. The aristocratic party opposed him. These enmities began in 1496, and their machinations finally effected his downfall. Savonarola was

forced into a conflict with the Pope; first by his refusal to visit Rome, then by his opposition to the Pope's order uniting the Florentine and Tuscan Dominicans. The Pope's purpose was to withdraw Savonarola from Florence. Finally, towards the middle of 1497, Alexander VI. excommunicated Savonarola;[1] not on the ground of heresy, however, but on account of his disobedience in the affair of the union of the Dominican congregations. In the latter part of that year Savonarola celebrated mass and later resumed preaching, notwithstanding the ban of excommunication. Then the Pope threatened to issue an interdict against the city of Florence, unless the Signory or government would exclude Savonarola from the pulpit or imprison him or send him to Rome. The pressure of this threat, and the final preponderance in the government of Florence of the party opposed to him, led to Savonarola's arrest, his trial and his death, May 23, 1498. He was first hung, and then his body was burned.

[1] Rev. J. L. O'Neil, O. P., in a recent work, "Was Savonarola Excommunicated?" (Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co., Publishers), has raised an interesting question.

Such is the story of Savonarola. His conflict with the Pope grew out of political, moral, and disciplinary issues rather than out of any questions of doctrine.[1] In all his difficulties he proclaimed himself "a true son of the Church." His indiscretions and his faults were due to his excessive earnestness and his devotion to the welfare of the people who put him to death. His motives were good and his life was unselfish. He was a devout and holy man, though doubtless at times an enthusiast and a visionary.

The elements of opposition, unable to meet him directly on the issue of good government *vs.* oligarchy and debauchery, pulled wires at Rome. They sought to get him disciplined on some matter of ecclesiastical regulation or procedure. He undoubtedly erred in disobeying the commands of his superior; he erred in the more important consequences of his first error, by continuing to officiate as a priest after

1 "It did not occur to him to doubt the institutions of his Church or to question her authority," says Mrs. Oliphant (The Making of Florence). "He was no apostle of reform (as understood by Luther)," says Symonds (Hist. Renaissance).

he had been excommunicated. His enemies had him technically in the wrong — as they planned.

History has since reversed the judgment of those days. Savonarola is now generally regarded as a great and good man. One of the later Popes, it is said, contemplated canonizing him as a saint of the Church. He was revered by St. Philip Neri and many other saintly men. Raphael painted him among the doctors of the Church. Fifteen Italian bishops in 1898 took part in the Savonarola commemorative exercises at Florence.

CANTÙ: Savonarola's career

"Savonarola" was "a man of faith, of superstition, of genius, abounding in charity. Contrary to Luther, who confided entirely in reason, he believed in personal inspiration. Arguments in his favor, as well as against him, may be drawn from his works, which, as a whole, evidence his attempt to harmonize reason with faith, Catholicity with political freedom. . . . In no wise did he impugn the authority of the Roman See, although he resisted one

whom he believed to be an illegitimate occupant of that See, and against whom he tried to invoke a council which would reform the Church legitimately. Pride resulted from popularity, opposition induced excess, but he worked with a pure conscience and without personal ambition. His opinions he endeavored to propagate by example, and not by force; he believed in the efficacy of truth. . . . Thinking to guide a mob by means of passion and of the hurly-burly of street crowds, he fell a victim to one and the other, as commonly happens. . . . The fame of Savonarola remains suspended between heaven and hell, but all deplored his death, and especially, perhaps, those that had caused it. . . . Not one of the followers of the great friar figures among the disciples of Luther or among the betrayers of his country's liberty. Michelangelo, who raised bastions for his native city, and also the grandest church in Christendom, always venerated Savonarola."

Cesare Cantù, Gli Eretici d' Italia, Torina, 1865, vol. i. pp. 234–235.

RANKE: His asceticism

"Among these rich, influential, educated, and solemn people [the people of Florence] a Dominican, Hieronymus Savonarola of Ferrara, had succeeded in making himself universally esteemed. He was, it is true, strict with himself and others, a solitary walker, a monk by inclination, and a man who also knew how to control his harsh voice. He admonished his monasterial brethren to give up all their property. He spared no one, not one of his fellow-citizens, the Brescians, the Florentines, nor his liege lords, the Pope and Lorenzo de' Medici, and all this could not help securing him a certain influence. But what made him really powerful were, before all else, his doctrines and his prophetic gifts."

Von Ranke, History of the Roman and German People, p. 85.

NEWMAN: A favourable view

In his sermon on the mission of St. Philip, Cardinal Newman depicts Savonarola as "a true son of St. Dominic in energy, in severity of life, in contempt of merely secular learning: a forerunner of St. Pius the Fifth

in boldness, in resoluteness, in zeal for the honor of the house of God, and for the restoration of holy discipline. It was the truth of his cause, the earnestness of his convictions, the singleness of his aims, the impartiality of his censures, the intrepidity of his menaces, which constituted the secret of his success."

CREIGHTON: The lesson of his career

"Savonarola's fate (says Creighton) is a type of the dangers which beset a noble soul drawn by its Christian zeal into conflict with the world. More and more he was driven to fight the Lord's battle with carnal weapons, till the prophet and statesman became inextricably entangled, and the message of the new life was interwoven with the political attitude of the Florentine Republic. Little by little he was driven into the open sea, till his frail bark was swallowed by the tempest. He encouraged Florence to adhere to an untenable position till all who wished to bring Florence into union with Italian aspirations were driven to conspire for his downfall."

Creighton, History of the Papacy, vol. iii. p. 247.

CREIGHTON: Later attitude of churchmen

"Even a pope so purely secular as Alexander VI. is said in latter years to have regretted Savonarola's death. Julius II. ordered Raffaelle to place him among the doctors of the Church in the great fresco of the 'Disputa,' and his claims to canonization were more than once discussed. The Church evidently grieved over his loss when he was gone, when political difficulties had passed away, and the memory of the fervent preacher of righteousness remained."

Creighton, History of the Papacy, vol. iii. p. 248.

Macaulay: Savonarola not a Protestant

"The spirit of Savonarola had nothing in common with the spirit, religious or political, of the Protestants of the North."

Macaulay's Essays (Von Ranke).

VIII

BIBLES BEFORE LUTHER

"*Thou hast set Thy Word as a light to my feet.*" — THOMAS À KEMPIS (A. D. 1425).

IT is ascertained that at least twenty-two versions, or different translations, of the Bible existed in the various tongues of Europe before Luther was born. Over seventy editions of the entire Bible in vernacular tongues were printed during the seventy years intervening from 1460 to 1530.[1] The Bible was printed twenty times in the German language before Luther's translation appeared (1530).

Two copies of a German Bible, printed in 1466, are preserved in the Senatorial library at Leipsic. The Mazarin Bible is

[1] The "Reportorium Bibliographicum," printed at Tübingen, reckons consecutively ninety-eight distinct editions before the year 1500, independently of twelve other editions which, together with the Latin text, presented the *glossa ordinaria* or the *postillas* of Lyranus."

considered the earliest complete book published. It was printed in Latin about 1455.[1]

A German edition of the Bible, published in 1460, is the earliest book printed with metal type and on both sides of the leaf.

Rev. Dr. Maitland, a learned divine of the Church of England, estimates that fifty Latin editions of the Bible were published before Luther was born. "To say nothing of parts of the Bible or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least twenty editions of the whole Latin Bible printed in Germany alone before Luther was born."[2]

Sickendorf, a biographer and disciple of Luther, mentions three German editions of the Bible, published at Wittenberg in 1470, 1483, and 1490.[3]

Menzel, in his history of Germany, says: "Before the time of Luther the Bible had already been translated and printed in both High and Low Dutch."[4]

Throughout the middle ages the Bible was the great popular book of Europe. Dr. Maitland says that the very literature

[1] Hallam, Literature of Europe, vol. i. p. 96.
[2] Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 469.
[3] Commentaries on Luther, libr. i. sec. 51.
[4] Menzel, vol. ii. p. 223.

of the time is written in the words and phrases of Scripture.

Fragments of Bishop Uphilas' Scriptural translation, written in the fourth century, are our oldest specimens of the Gothic tongue. The Venerable Bede and King Alfred both contributed Anglo-Saxon translations of parts of the Bible. In the fourteenth century John de Tarvisa made a full English translation.

The Protestant biblical scholar, Bishop Usher, states that the first French translation of the Bible was made in 1478. It was successively republished sixteen times before 1546. A Flemish translation by Merland, in 1210, is also mentioned by Usher. Seven editions of this version were printed before Luther's translation appeared.

The complete Bible in Spanish was edited by Boniface Ferrer, in 1405. The Spaniards are to be credited, too, with the first polyglot edition of the Sacred Scriptures.[1] This

[1] Carranza, the celebrated Archbishop of Toledo, says in the Prologue to his "Commentaries": "Before the heresies of Luther appeared, I do not know that the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue were anywhere forbidden. In Spain the Bible was translated into Spanish by order of the Catholic sovereigns, at the time when

edition was printed in six different languages at Madrid, in 1515, under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes. Italian translations of the Bible were common throughout the middle ages, and numerous editions were printed at Venice, Florence, Naples, and Rome prior to Luther's time. A Bohemian Bible was published at Prague in 1488. There are Danish authorities who state that the Icelanders had an entire translation of the Scriptures in the thirteenth century.

One of the greatest books of the middle ages is the "Imitation of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis, published about the year 1425.

We find in its pages the best evidence of the mediæval attitude and practice in the matter of Bible-reading. À Kempis, who was a monk in the archdiocese of Cologne, had himself made a MS. copy of the Bible. In the first book, chapter i. of the "Imitation," there are some useful directions about reading the Holy Scriptures: —

"All Holy Scripture should be read in the

the Moors and Jews were allowed to live among the Christians according to their own law."

spirit in which it was written. Our curiosity is often a hinderance to us in reading the Scriptures, when we wish to understand and to discuss, where we ought to pass on in simplicity. . . . If thou wilt derive profit, read with humility, with simplicity, with faith, and never wish to have the name of learning."

In the eleventh chapter of the fourth book he says: —

"I shall have moreover for my consolation and a mirror of life Thy Holy Books, and above all Thy Most Holy Body for my especial remedy and refuge. . . . Whilst detained in the prison of this body I acknowledge that I need two things, food and light. Thou hast therefore given to me, weak as I am, Thy Sacred Body for the nourishment of my soul and body, and Thou hast set Thy word as a light to my feet. Without these two I could not live; for the word of God is the light of soul and Thy Sacrament is the bread of life. These also may be called the two tables set on either side in the storehouse of Thy holy Church."

The mediæval mind, as here laid bare, does not seem to raise any questions as to

whether it is wise to read the Bible or as to whether the Bible is difficult to procure. These matters are evidently not even contemplated as possible issues; on the contrary, the excellence of Scripture reading and its necessity as "the light of the soul" are dwelt upon. Be it remembered, too, that this manual of À Kempis came at once into the hands of the laity as well as of the clergy, for it went into the vernaculars of every nation in Europe only a few years after its first publication.

In 1877 Mr. H. Stevens published, at South Kensington, a "List of Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition," respecting which an English paper makes this comment: "This catalogue will be very useful for one thing, at any rate, as disproving the popular fable about Luther's *finding* the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only are there many editions of the Latin Vulgate long anterior to that time, but there were actually nine German editions of the Bible in the Caxton Exhibition earlier than 1483, the year of Luther's birth, and at least three more before the end of the century."

HALLAM: The Bible in the vernacular

"In the eighth and ninth centuries, when the vulgate had ceased to be generally intelligible, there is no reason to suspect any intention in the Church to deprive the laity of the Scriptures. Translations were freely made into the vernacular languages, and, perhaps, read in churches. . . . Louis the Debonair is said to have caused a German version of the New Testament to be made. Otfrid, in the same century, rendered the gospels, or, rather, abridged them, into German verse. This work is still extant."

Hallam, Middle Ages, chap. ix. part ii.

BLUNT: The Bible open to the laity

The well-known Anglican writer, Dr. Blunt, in his "History of the Reformation" (vol. i. pp. 501–502) tells us that "there has been much wild and foolish writing about the scarcity of the Bible in the ages preceding the Reformation. It has been taken for granted that the Holy Scripture was almost a sealed book until it was printed in English by Tyndal and Coverdale, and that the only source of knowledge respecting it before

then was the translation made by Wyckliffe. The facts are . . . that all laymen who could read were, as a rule, provided with their Gospels, their Psalter, or other devotional portions of the Bible. Men did, in fact, take a vast amount of personal trouble with respect to the productions of the Holy Scriptures; and accomplished by head, hand, and heart what is now chiefly done by paid workmen and machinery. The clergy studied the Word of God and made it known to the laity; and those few among the laity who could read had abundant opportunity of reading the Bible, either in Latin or English, up to the Reformation period."

MAITLAND: The Bible in the dark ages

"To come, however, to the question, Did people in the dark ages know anything of the Bible? Certainly, it was not as commonly known and as generally in the hands of men as it is now, and has been almost ever since the invention of printing — the reader must not suspect me of wishing to maintain any such absurd opinion; but I do think that there is sufficient evidence (1) that during that period the

Scriptures were more accessible to those who could use them, (2) were, in fact, more used, and (3) by a greater number of persons, than some modern writers would lead us to suppose."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 220.

MAITLAND: The Bible in Germany

Dr. Maitland says: "To say nothing of parts of the Bible, or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible printed in Germany only, before Luther was born. . . . Before Luther was born the Bible had been printed in Rome, Naples, Florence, and Piacenza, and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 469.

REUSS: The Bible often printed

Reuss says: "No book was so frequently published, immediately after the first invention of printing, as the Latin Bible, more than one hundred editions of it being struck off before the year 1520."

HALLAM: The First German Bible

"The first German printed Bible, bearing the arms of Frederick III., issued from the Mainz press in 1462. In 1462 Faust published a Bible commonly called the Mentz Bible."

Hallam, Introd. to Literature, part i. Lecture 3.

Another version appeared in 1466, two copies of which are still preserved in the Senatorial library at Leipsic. Other versions were published rapidly.

MAITLAND: A fable about Luther

"Before Luther was born the Bible had been printed in Rome, and the printers had the assurance to memorialize his Holiness, praying that he would help them off with some copies. It had been printed, too, at Naples, Florence, and Piacenza; and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions. No doubt, we should be within the truth if we were to say that beside the multitude of manuscript copies, not yet fallen into disuse, the press had issued fifty different editions of the whole Latin Bible; to say nothing of Psalters, New Testaments, or

other parts. And yet, more than twenty years after, we find a young man who had received "a very liberal education," who "had made great proficiency in his studies at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and Erfurt," and who, nevertheless, did not know what a Bible was, simply because "the Bible was unknown in those days. [This refers to the absurd story — as told by D'Aubigné, — of Luther "discovering" a Bible for the first time when he was twenty years old]."

Maitland, The Dark Ages, p. 506.

Note. — Dr. De Costa, in the "Catholic World Magazine" for August, 1900, tells the story of the chained Bible at Erfurt in 1507:

"No doubt there was a chained Bible at Erfurt in 1507. Chained Bibles were found two hundred years later, as chained directories are seen to-day in hotels. The preface of the pre-Luther German Bibles stated that the book was 'for the use of unlettered simple folk, lay and spiritual.' They were quoted freely in sermons, and when Luther's edition appeared, Zwingle, a fellow-reformer, charged Luther with changing and mutilating the Word of God, which was deliberately done in the King James' translation, as the revised edition now shows."

IX

THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING

Then sculpture and her sister arts revived,
Stones leaped to form and rocks began to live,
With sweeter notes each rising temple rang,
A Raphael painted and a Vida sang.

POPE.

THERE was a gradual recovery from barbarism and disorder all throughout the middle ages; but the epoch usually referred to as that of the "Revival of Learning" comes towards the close of mediæval history. What had been going on at a slow pace during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries then broke into a canter and a gallop; and the rapidity with which new things came into use — inventions crowding in upon each other, commerce broadening into discovery, and the material comforts of the people vastly improving — tended to make the people feel a new strength and take a more cheerful view of life.

Although "the horologue of Time does not peal out the passage from one era to another," the epoch of the Revival may be said to date from the invention of printing in 1440. It culminated about the end of the century, in what was termed "the Golden Age" of Pope Leo X. Leo was one of the Medici, a Florentine family, justly famed for its patronage of the arts.

The manifestations of the epoch were in its literature, its discoveries, and its political and material advances.

The nations began to develop their vernaculars. Poetry and history were written in other tongues besides the scholastic Latin. England had her Chaucer, and Italy her Petrarch. Vigorous German, elegant French, and sonorous Spanish were rounded and polished into literature.

The rise of free cities, the development of commerce, the Hanseatic league, and the spread of the Italian banking system were other features of the age.

Marco Polo, the famous Venetian navigator, had daring competitors in Bartholomew Diaz and Vasco da Gama. They rounded the Cape of Good Hope and planted Euro-

pean outposts in the Indies. Finally Columbus comes with his discovery of a new world, — 1492, — year of the greatest event in the Christian era.

The cannon booming at the siege of Constantinople, in 1453, was a clear and emphatic announcement to the world that the age of gunpowder was at hand.

1. The fall of that city, then the capital of Greek culture, sent scores of learned refugees into Italy, Germany, and France, where they were received with open arms and installed as teachers in the universities.[1]

2. This, and the invention of printing — an almost contemporaneous occurrence — are considered the two great causes of the revival of learning.

The Greeks roused a new interest in classical study. Simultaneously there was a new interest in scientific study, partly but not entirely due to contact with the Arabs and Moors. The literature of every coun-

[1] "The drooping Muses then he westward called,
From the famed city by Propontic sea,
What time the Turk the enfeebled Grecian thralled:
Thence from their cloistered walks he set them free."

THOMSON.

try felt the impulse of this awakened converse. It was a "new birth" to letters, and the epoch has been fitly so called, — the Renaissance.

As for printing, it is easy to imagine its vast importance.[1] It went into immediate and universal use. The Bible was in type A. D. 1455. Pamphlets, political screeds, satires, lampoons, caricatures, and popular songs were sent into circulation by the thousands. Letters were brought down to the masses.

We may properly add as other and more remote causes of the revival: —

3. The Crusades, which, the more they are studied, the more drastic does their influence on European civilization appear.

4. The great universities, founded in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, under the fostering care of the Church, now efflorescing under the ray of reflected light

1 "Gutenberg, without knowing it, was the Mechanist of the New World. In creating the communications of new ideas, he had assured the independence of reason. Every letter of this alphabet which left his fingers contained in it more power than the armies of kings and the thunder of pontiffs. It was mind which he furnished with language." — LAMARTINE.

let in from the East; — stored with the intellectual energies of the preceding ages and conserving the libraries of Europe.

The larger number of the great universities of modern Europe were established in the middle ages. Those of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Ferrara were in existence for a century or more prior to A. D. 1000. As to the age of the others, the following are the most generally accepted dates: Salamanca, 1200; Cambridge, 1280; Prague, 1358; Vienna, 1365; Ingolstadt, 1372; Leipsic, 1408; Louvain, 1425; Basle, 1469; Alcala, 1517.

Considering the population and condition of Europe at the time, fifteen universities was a generous allowance; and it hardly accords with the popular notion of the culture of those days that so great provision was required for higher education. This is especially true when we are informed that Oxford had a larger enrolment during the middle ages than it has had at any time since, — some three thousand halls being required for the convenience of students, and the attendance varying from 5000 to 25,000. The eloquence of Abelard is said to have

drawn nearly 30,000 students to the University of Paris, and they came from all parts of Europe. The reconquest from barbarism must have been in an advanced stage, when the mind of Europe created such emporiums of learning.

HALLAM: Mediæval universities

"At Oxford, under Henry III., it is said there were 30,000 scholars,— an exaggeration which seems to imply that the real number was very great. A respectable writer asserts that there were fully 10,000 at Bologna about the same time. . . . At the death of Charles VII. in 1453, it [the University of Paris] is said to have contained 25,000 students."

Hallam, View of the Middle Ages, ch. ix. part ii.

ADAMS: Scholasticism organized the universities

"In another direction the age of scholasticism exerted a permanent influence upon the intellectual history of the world. This was in the organization of the universities of Europe. The intense eagerness to learn which characterized the times seized upon

the best of the already existing schools and transformed them. The number of students grew enormously, and at the same time the number and skill of the teachers. The branches of learning began to be differentiated from one another, and teachers and students to specialize in their studies. New methods of study were also introduced, — dialectics in theology and the use of Justinian's code in law. With the increase in numbers, these schools took on a more definite organization and became great self-governing communities of a democratic cast, or at least democratic after a certain stage in the course of education had been reached. Together they formed indeed a kind of international community with a common language, very frequent immigration from one to another, and a recognized standing in any one for those who held the degrees of another. In most of these universities the student life and much of the instruction centred in the college system, which survives to-day in the English universities."

European History (p. 264), by Geo. B. Adams, Professor of History in Yale University. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

SCHAFF: Renaissance matured under the Pope

"This literary and artistic movement extended from the fourteenth to the middle of the sixteenth century. It is variously styled the *Revival of Letters*, the age of *Humanism*, by the French term *Renaissance*, and the Italian *Rinascimento*. In the widest sense the *Renaissance* comprehends the revival of literature and art, the progress of philosophy and criticism, the discovery of the solar system by Copernicus and Galileo, the extinction of feudalism, the development of the great nationalities and languages of modern Europe, the emancipation of enslaved intelligence, the expansion and freedom of thought, the invention of the printing press, the discovery and exploration of America and the East; in one word, all the progressive developments of the later middle ages. . . . The Renaissance was born in the Republic of Florence, under the patronage of the Medici family, and matured in Rome under the patronage of the Pope. From these two centres it spread all over Italy, France, Germany, Holland, and England. It ascended the papal throne with

Nicholas V. (1447–55), the founder of the Vatican Library, and was nurtured by his successor, Pius II. (1458–64), Sixtus IV. (1471–84), who founded the Sistine Chapel, Julius II. (1503–13), who called Bramante, Michael Angelo, and Raphael to Rome, and Leo. X. (1513–22), who gave them the most liberal encouragement in their works of art. The Renaissance was the last great movement of history in which Italy and the Popes took the lead."

The Renaissance (ch. ii. pp. 9–10), by Philip Schaff, D.D., Prof. of Church History in Union Theological Seminary. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1891.

PASTOR: Encouraged by the Church

"The partial and short-sighted view which condemned the whole Renaissance movement as dangerous to faith and morals, cannot be considered as that of the Church. At this time, as throughout the whole of the middle ages, she showed herself to be the patroness of all wholesome intellectual progress, the protectress of all true culture and civilization."

History of the Popes (since the close of the Middle Ages), by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Prof. of History in the University of Innsbruck, vol. i. p. 54. London: John Hodges, Pub., 1891.

SYMONDS: Italy led the way

"The reason why Italy took the lead in the Renaissance was that Italy possessed a language, a favorable climate, political freedom, and commercial prosperity, at a time when other nations were still semi-barbarous. It was at the beginning of the fourteenth century, when Italy had lost indeed the heroic spirit which we admire in her Communes of the thirteenth, but had gained instead ease, wealth, magnificence, and that repose which springs from long prosperity, that the new age at last began."

J. A. Symonds, Renaissance in Italy, Age of the Despots, ch. i.

PASTOR: Nicholas V. and the revival of learning

"It has often been said that the Renaissance itself ascended the Papal Throne with Nicholas V. Yet it must not be forgotten that the great Pontiff was throughout on the side of the genuine and Christian Renaissance. The founder of the Vatican Library, like Fra Angelico whom he employed to paint his study in that palace, knew how

to reconcile his admiration for the intellectual treasures of the past with the claims of the Christian religion; he could honor both Cicero and St. Augustine, and could appreciate the grandeur and beauty of heathen antiquity without being thereby led to forget Christianity. The leading idea of Nicholas V. was to make the capital of Christendom the capital also of classical literature and the centre of science and art. The realization of this noble project was, however, attended with many difficulties and great dangers. If Nicholas V. overlooked or underestimated the perils which threatened ecclesiastical interests from the side of the heathen revolutionary Renaissance, this is the only error that can be laid to his charge. His aim was essentially lofty and noble, and worthy of the Papacy. The fearlessness of this large-hearted man in face of the dangers of the movement — a fearlessness which has in it something imposing — strikes us all the more forcibly when we consider the power and influence which the Renaissance had at this time attained in Italy. The attempt to assume its guidance was a great deed and one worthy of the

successor of the Gregories and the Innocents."

Pastor's History of the Popes, ch. i. p. 55.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPEDIA: Began in Italy

"The Renaissance must, indeed, be viewed mainly as an internal process whereby spiritual energies latent in the middle ages were developed into actuality and formed a mental habit for the modern world. The process began in Italy, and gradually extended to the utmost bounds of Europe, producing similar results in every nation and establishing a common form of civilization."

Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xx. p. 238.

X

INDULGENCES

Let us do no injustice to the beliefs of our ancestors. — HINDOO SAYING.

THE word "indulgence," according to Webster, is derived from the Latin verb *indulgere*, "to be kind or tender to one." He defines an indulgence to be: "Remission of the temporal punishment due to sins, after the guilt of sin has been remitted by sincere repentance; absolution from the censures and public penances of the Church." [1]

This, though not fully explicit, does not differ greatly from the definition given by Catholics themselves in their catechisms and by their recognized authorities, both before

[1] An indulgence is thus defined by the Century Dictionary: "A remission of the punishment still due to sin after sacramental absolution, this remission being valid in the court of conscience and before God, and being made by an application of the treasure of the Church on the part of a lawful superior." This definition in respect to clearness also leaves something to be desired.

and after the time of the Protestant Reformation. As a definition, however, it may not prove so clear and comprehensive as the average reader would desire. Indulgences have played a part in history, and it is quite important to obtain a right grasp of their nature and object.

We clear the ground for this right understanding by stating what indulgences are *not*. They are not licenses to commit sin; neither are they pardons for sins already committed. Having disposed of these misapprehensions, we may take up Webster's definition and examine its terms.

An indulgence is a remission granted by the Pope or Church "of the temporal punishment due to sins:"— a discharge or pardon from some kind of punishment which would otherwise have to be endured.

But what is meant by "temporal punishment due to sins"? In the Bible (2 Kings xii. 13–14), the Prophet Nathan says to David: "The Lord also has taken away thy sin; nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing the child that is born of thee shall surely die." Though

the eternal guilt of David's sin was forgiven, the temporal punishment was still to be expiated. The Church imposed penances upon its repentant children as a commutation of the temporal punishment due sin. Among the early Christians, severe penances were imposed on those of the faithful who confessed to grievous sins. Violation of the Sabbath day, by any servile work, for instance, was punished by three days on bread and water. Perjury was punishable by the sinner being obliged to sell all his goods and give the proceeds to the poor. In the course of time it became a more general practice to remit these severe penances upon the penitent complying with certain conditions, such as prayer and almsgiving; and this mitigation or remission was regarded an *indulgence* on the part of the Church.

It never was the teaching of the Church, nor the belief of the Christians in any age, that an indulgence was a forgiveness of sin, much less a license to commit sin.

Luther, when he attacked the alleged traffic in indulgences, did not question the right of the Church to grant them, nor did he say that they were not of great spiritual

value.[1] It was somewhat later in his career that he came out against the whole teaching on indulgences; it was not until he struck at other Catholic teachings, such as Papal supremacy, priestly celibacy, and the necessity of good works for salvation.

Prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, together with confession and repentance, were the conditions prescribed in the famous bull of Leo X., proclaiming an indulgence. Even D'Aubigné says: "In the Pope's bull something was said of repentance of the heart and confession of the lips."[2] Pope Leo X. desired to use the alms thus contributed in completing St. Peter's Cathedral at Rome,[3] than which

> "What could be
> Of earthly structures in His honor piled
> Of sublimer aspect? Majesty,
> Power, glory, strength, and beauty, all are aisled
> In this eternal ark of worship undefiled."

---

[1] He did not as yet impugn the doctrine of indulgences itself, and he expressed his conviction that their good father, the Pope, must be altogether unaware of the extent to which such abuses [sale of indulgences] were allowed to prevail." — Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xx. p. 326.

[2] Vol. i. p. 214.

[3] St. Peter's was begun in 1506 and completed in 1629. It cost nearly fifty million dollars.

John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, was commissioned by the Archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg to preach the indulgence in Germany. Luther, an Augustinian friar, was moved to denounce Tetzel's methods and to point out his mistakes. At first the conflict seemed to be merely a "monkish quarrel."

As to what Tetzel's mistakes were, there is a mass of controversy. It was charged that his way of presenting the advantages of indulgences to the people partook of the nature of a sale. Still, D'Aubigné, an ultra-Protestant historian, tells us that "the hand that delivered the indulgence could not receive the money, — that was forbidden under the severest penalties."[1] Confession and repentance were always made prerequisites.

But the very payment of money as a part of a religious duty, whether for alms or for practical good works, could quite easily take on the appearance of a purchase. Especially would this be the case if the other and more essential requirements, such as true sorrow, humble confession, and full

[1] Vol. i. p. 214.

reparation, were slurred over and the most stress laid upon almsgiving.

An eminent Catholic authority (Cardinal Gibbons in his "Faith of our Fathers," page 393) says: "Tetzel's conduct was disavowed and condemned by the representative of the Holy See. The Council of Trent, which was held some time afterwards, took effectual measures to put a stop to all irregularities regarding indulgences, and issued the following decree: 'Wishing to correct and amend the abuses which have crept into them, and on occasion of which this signal name of Indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, the holy Synod enjoins in general, by the present decree, that all wicked traffic for obtaining them, which has been the fruitful source of many abuses among the Christian people, should be wholly abolished.'"[1]

Indulgences as defined A.D. 1500

The following definitions of indulgences are taken from popular books of instruction that were current in Germany at the end

[1] Sess. xxv., Dec. de Indulgentiis.

of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century.

The Seelenfuehrer says: "Know ye, that indulgence does not forgive your sins, but only remits the punishment which you have deserved. Know ye, that you can obtain no indulgence when you are in sin, and have not confessed and truly repented, and really determined to improve your life; for otherwise all is to no purpose."

The Summa Johannis, of the year 1480, declares that "only he who sincerely repents of his sins can gain the indulgence . . . if the man be in a state of mortal sin he cannot gain the indulgence, for it is not given to sinners."

"To those who said that indulgence was forgiveness of sins for money, and therefore that it could be bought," the explanation of the Articles of the Creed (A. D. 1486), remarks: "That it was a question of the praise and honor of God, and not of the collection of money."

Again, "The indulgence is not given to those who simply contribute to the building of churches, unless they are in a state of grace, and give out of piety, in true faith,

with great confidence in the communion of Saints, and their merits, in whose honor and praise the churches are built, and with special confidence in the mercy and help of God."

See Janssen, History of the German People, vol. i. pp. 41–42.

Documentary Evidences

For a full and scholarly review of the documentary aspects of the indulgence of 1517 the reader is referred to Janssen's "History of the German People," and especially to the fourteenth letter in his *An mein Kritiker* (To my Critics), Freiburg, 1882. The bull proclaiming the indulgence and the instructions to the preachers of the indulgence throughout Germany are quoted to show that confession, sincere repentance, and fasting were conditions to be insisted upon with much emphasis from all who sought the indulgence. Even Tetzel, in his anti-theses, directed against Luther's theses, is quoted as explaining that no indulgence can be gained except by sincere repentance and confession. No alms were to be demanded; contributions were to be

voluntary. "That in spite of the strict regulations of the instructions to the preachers of the indulgence, grievous abuses occurred, I have," says Janssen, "set forth in my history (vol. ii. p. 77)." All the documents of the case have been gathered by Kapp, a Lutheran authority (Leipsic, 1721), and Janssen's citations are to Kapp's collection.

Decrees of the Council of Trent (A. D. 1545)

The Council of Trent asserts that the power of conferring indulgences was given by Christ to the Church; that she has always used this power; that the use of indulgences, as being most salutary, is to be retained in the Church; that those are condemned by the Council who say that the Church has no power of granting them. In granting them, moderation is to be observed, lest Church discipline be enervated. Abuses are to be reformed. All evil gains are to be abolished. Other abuses, that cannot be specially prohibited, are to be reported in the Provincial Synod by the Bishop, reviewed by the other Bishops in the Synod, and referred to the Pope, "that thus the gift of the holy indulgences may be dis-

pensed to all the faithful, piously, holily, and incorruptibly."

Sess. xxv. ch. 21, Waterworth's translation, p. 277.

"It is decreed that these heavenly treasures of the Church are administered not for gain but for godliness."

Sess. xxv. ch. 9.

CARDINAL WISEMAN: Defines indulgences

The learned Cardinal Wiseman, in a pastoral letter, says: "Many persons will be inclined to incredulity when I tell them that an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future. It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, of a portion, or the entire, of the temporal punishment due to sin."

Cardinal Wiseman, London Tablet, June 17, 1854.

CARDINAL GIBBONS: Defines indulgences

"The word indulgence originally signified favor, remission, or forgiveness. Now it is commonly used in the sense of unlawful gratification, and of free scope to the

passions. Hence, when some ignorant or prejudiced persons hear of the Church granting an indulgence, the idea of license to sin is at once presented to their minds. An indulgence is simply a remission, in whole or in part, through the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and His saints, of the temporal punishment due to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted. It should be borne in mind that, even after our guilt is removed, there often remains some punishment to be undergone, either in this life or in the next, as an expiation to divine sanctity and justice."

Cardinal Gibbons, Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 384–385.

WILMERS: Definition by a Jesuit authority

"An indulgence is a remission of temporal punishment due to sin after the sin itself has been remitted, granted outside the sacrament of penance. In the sacrament of penance the temporal punishment is commuted into a lighter penance; by indulgence it is remitted; not simply, however, but by the application of the satisfactions

of Christ and of the saints intrusted to the Church's keeping. . . . Indulgences are salutary, not only because they remit temporal punishment due to sin, but also because they encourage sinners to become reconciled to God, and promote the frequentation of the sacraments and the practice of good works. If, at times, almsgiving is prescribed as a condition for gaining an indulgence, the indulgence is in that case no more purchased for money than heaven is purchased by any other alms given with a view to eternal salvation."

Handbook of Christian Religion (pp. 360–362), by Rev. W. Wilmers, S. J. New York: Benziger Bros., Pub., 1891.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: The Catholic teaching stated

"Indulgence in Roman Catholic theology is defined as the remission, in whole or in part, by ecclesiastical authority, to the penitent sinner of the temporal punishment due for sin. It must carefully be borne in mind that in Roman Catholic orthodoxy indulgence is never absolutely gratuitous, and that those only can, in any circumstances, validly receive it who are in full communion

with the Church, and have resorted to the sacrament of penance, in which alone, after due contrition and confession, provision is made for the graver penalty of sin."

Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xii. pp. 846–847.

ADAMS: Money was given as alms

"A letter of indulgence was a written document granted by some one in authority in the Church, by which, in view of some pious act, the temporal penalties of sin were said to be remitted or changed in character in favor of the holder. The letter itself, which was written in Latin as an official document of the Church, stated that the remission was of no avail without due repentance and forsaking of sin. For three centuries or more it had been customary in the Church to grant these letters in return for donations of money to be applied to charitable uses or to advance the interests of the Church on the theory that the gift of alms was a pious act which might take the place of penance in other forms."

European History (p. 302), by Geo. B. Adams, Professor of History in Yale University. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

XI

THE CAUSE AND SUCCESS OF PROTESTANTISM

For, in fact, it is the age that forms the man, not the man that forms the age. . . . If Luther had been born in the tenth century, he would have effected no Reformation. If he had never been born at all, it is evident that the sixteenth century could not have elapsed without a great schism in the church.

MACAULAY.

CAUSE and pretext are two different things. The occasion for the outbreak of Lutheranism in Germany was the method pursued by Tetzel and other monks in the preaching and granting of indulgences. As well might we attribute the American Revolution to the destruction of the gunpowder stored at Lexington and Concord, where

"the embattled farmer stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world,"

as to make Tetzel's extravagance and abuse the cause of the Protestant revolution. The Lexington gun set in motion multiform and latent causes that reached back for a generation. The fight on indulgences broadened into a clash of authority that swept into its current causes existing for centuries.

These causes existed from the beginning of the Christian era, and they exist to-day. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries they expressed themselves in the heresies of Berengarius, the Albigenses, Peter Waldo, Huss, and Wycliffe. They have since continued to operate with Protestantism, splitting it up into numbers of warring sects, by means of local and provincial reformation-moves, such as the Methodist secession from the Church of England.

The Protestant Reformation, in fact, does not differ in cause from the great heresies which preceded it. All had their source in the tendency of the human mind to set private judgment above established authority, whether in religion, law, or letters.

The time was not ripe for a successful revolution when Wycliffe wrote, or when

Berengarius preached; or these men lacked Luther's alternate cunning and boldness; or they failed to lay hold of the means and methods of success which he eagerly grasped. Here was the difference: it was not in cause, it was merely in circumstance and success.

The moral and material condition of the Church was not bad at the epoch Luther appeared. It was worse a century earlier — at the time of the "great schism." The circumstances of the Lutheran movement, which made it a successful revolution, may be briefly stated as follows:

1. It everywhere sought the protection and support of princes. The Emperor Maximilian, Frederick, Elector of Saxony, and Philip of Hesse were Luther's steadfast friends. In the first instance, they favored him because of their dislike of the Papal power. Afterwards he made it their interest to join forces with him. He flattered their power. He taught that they were rulers by divine right, and that unquestioning obedience was the religious duty of the subject. He made them the arbiters on ecclesiastical questions. A church subservient and accommodating to

the civil power was exceedingly agreeable to potentates whose absolutism had always been, more or less, interfered with by bishops and Popes. In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa patronized the Reformation; in Denmark, Christian II.; in England, Henry VIII., for a time, and Elizabeth; in France, the Court of Navarre and the Prince of Condé; in the Netherlands, William of Orange.

2. It utilized the rich lands and treasures of the monasteries with astute policy. To the kings, electors, and petty princes the reformers virtually said: "Embrace our cause and we will give you the wealth of the monasteries and the churches. It will pay you well. It will fill your coffers, and the new religion will put a salve upon your consciences by calling this expedition of plunder a new crusade, — a stroke against the minions of Satan and the disciples of anti-Christ." The bait to avarice worked powerful conversions; the adhesion of princes to the new creed being followed by a public profession of faith by way of a raïd on the convents. The Elector of Saxony filled his sideboard with vessels

taken from the sacristies of churches. Luther remarked with shrewd humor: "The ostensories of the churches made many converts to the new gospel." Gustavus Vasa, in Sweden, Christian of Denmark, and Henry VIII. of England, made the suppression of the monasteries the first act in the drama of the Reformation.

After the wealth of the Church had gone to the kings and princes, and through them to the court favorites, the reformers could sagely say: "Our fortunes and yours are inseparable. If we fall, you lose your new properties. You read your title to them through our teachings. Let the old religion reconquer and there will have to be restitution."

3. There is no doubt that the abolition of celibacy brought to the Protestant movement a great body of ex-monks who worked for it with the zeal of men working for the gratification of desires and their own salvation from social obloquy. The Teutonic knights went over in a body, on this principle. The vituperation and vigor of the new gospel came, in a large degree, from this following.

4. The art of printing was another, and, perhaps, a principal reason for the success, in 1517, of what had failed in the previous centuries. The reformers made instant and effective use of this means of sowing broadcast their views. They multiplied books, pamphlets, satires, burlesques, caricatures, and fiery appeals. These methods naturally moved the populace and won partisans.

BISHOP STUBBS: Won by force

"Where Protestantism was an idea only, as in France and Italy, it was crushed out by the Inquisition; where, in conjunction with political power, and sustained by ecclesiastical confiscation, it became a physical force, there it was lasting. It is not a pleasant view to take of the doctrinal changes, to see that where the movements toward it were pure and unworldly, it failed; where it was seconded by territorial greed and political animosity, it succeeded."

Bishop Stubbs, Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History, p. 233.

MACAULAY: Methods of the Reformers

"We cannot but remember that libels scarcely less scandalous than those of

Hebert, mummeries scarcely less absurd than those of Clootz, and crimes scarcely less atrocious than those of Marat, disgrace the early history of Protestantism."

Macaulay's Essays: "Burleigh."

HALLAM: Current fallacies

"Whatever may be the bias of our minds as to the truth of Luther's doctrines, we should be very careful, in considering the Reformation as a part of the history of mankind, not to be misled by the superficial and ungrounded representations which we sometimes find in modern writers, — like D'Aubigné, for example. Such is this, that Luther, struck by the absurdity of the prevailing superstitions, was desirous of introducing a more rational system of religion; or, that he contended for freedom of inquiry, and the boundless privileges of individual judgment; or, what others have been pleased to suggest, that his zeal for learning and ancient philosophy led him to attack the ignorance of the monks and the crafty policy of the Church, which withstood all liberal studies. These notions are merely fallacious refinements, as every

man of plain understanding — excepting, perhaps, D'Aubigné — who is acquainted with the writings of the early reformers or who has considered their history, must acknowledge."

Hallam, History of Literature, vol. i. p. 165.

MOSHEIM: Much violence

"For every impartial and attentive observer of the rise and progress of the Reformation will acknowledge that wisdom and prudence did not always attend the transactions of those that were concerned in this glorious cause; that many things were done with violence, temerity, and precipitation: and what is still worse, that several of the principal agents in this great revolution were actuated more by the impulse of passions and views of interest than by a zeal for the advancement of true religion."

Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History.

HALLAM: Force used in England

"An historian whose bias was certainly not unfavorable to Protestantism (Burnett, vol. iii. pp. 190, 196) confesses that all endeavors were too weak to overcome the aver-

sion of the people towards reformation, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais on account of the bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition. This is somewhat an humiliating admission, that the Protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army. It is certain that the re-establishment of popery on Mary's accession must have been acceptable to a large part or perhaps the majority of the nation."

Hallam, Const. Hist. of England, vol. i. ch. ii.

MACAULAY: How Protestantism succeeded in England

"A king whose character may be best described by saying that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile Parliament, — such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest."

Macaulay's Essays: "Hallam."

SMILES: In Ireland

"The 'Reformation from Popery' was completed in Elizabeth's reign. The history of this movement in Ireland is, throughout, one of merciless persecution, of wholesale spoliation, and of murderous cruelty. The instruments by which it was accomplished were despotic monarchs, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, and venal and slavish parliaments. It sprung from brutal passion, was nurtured in selfish and corrupt policy, and was consummated in bloodshed and horrid crime. 'The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest.' Such was the 'Reformation,' and such were its instruments; and the consequences which flowed from it, at least in Ireland, were of a kindred character for centuries to come."

Samuel Smiles, History of Ireland and the Irish People under the Government of England.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: In Sweden

"In Sweden the Reformation was established concurrently with the political revo-

lution which placed Gustavus Vasa on the throne. It was, however, only too apparent that the patriot king was largely influenced by the expectation of replenishing his exhausted exchequer from the revenues of the Church, and, as in Germany and England, the assent of the nobility was gained by their admission to a considerable share in the confiscated property."

Encyclopædia Britannica: "Reformation," vol. xx. p. 336.

XII

CHARACTER OF THE REFORMERS

Reputation is an idle and most false imposition; oft got without merit, and lost without deserving. — SHAKESPEARE.

LUTHER and Melanchthon were the leaders of Protestantism in Germany, Calvin and Zwinglius in France and Switzerland, and John Knox in Scotland. In England and Sweden the monarchs, Henry VIII. and Gustavus Vasa, were the reformers.

Luther was a man of force, audacity, and great power of expression. He is criticised for his violence, his cunning, and his roystering. Melanchthon was the scholar of the Reformation, and the gentleman, too, perhaps. Beyond the charge of wavering in his doctrines and frequently changing his views, he is the least assailed of any of the reformers. Calvin was the master

of a polished and logical style. His character was grave, gloomy, and despotic. Zwinglius was impetuous and warlike; he died at the head of a band of soldiers in 1531. Knox, who has been termed the "ruffian of the Reformation," was coarse, violent, and gloomy, but master of a style of rude eloquence that swayed what he termed the "rascally multitude."

All of these men, except Calvin and Melanchthon, had been ordained priests prior to their rupture with the Church. Luther married a nun; Knox signalized his revolt from Rome by taking a wife, and Calvin and Zwinglius married wealthy widows.

Luther's sermons are the best evidences of his style. His shrewd adaptation of doctrines to please princes and conciliate powerful magnates shows his cunning and astuteness. He permitted Philip of Hesse to have two wives, but he enjoined secrecy lest the "rough peasants" might also claim that privilege. His "Table Talk" purports to be a collection of his wit and wisdom delivered at the Black Eagle tavern, where he met boon companions and drank copious quantities of wine. The famous saying, —

"Who loves not woman, wine, and song
Remains a fool his whole life long,"

is Goethe's rendering of a sentiment very generally attributed to Luther. Hallam seems to believe the supposition "almost justified that there was a vein of insanity in his very remarkable character." [1]

Calvin's vindictiveness is sufficiently shown in his conduct towards Servetus. He lured his victim to Geneva and then had him condemned to death. Geneva was governed by Blue Laws of a much stricter kind than those which prevailed in the New England colonies. At times the sway of Calvin is comparable to the French "Reign of Terror," and the character of Marat, as drawn by Carlyle, has resemblances to that of Calvin.

FROUDE: An unfavorable view of the Reformers

"Lord Macaulay can hardly find epithets strong enough to express his contempt for Archbishop Cranmer. Mr. Buckle places

[1] Constitutional History of England, vol. i. ch. ii. p. 73 n.

Cranmer by the side of Bonner, and hesitated which of the two characters is the more detestable. . . . An unfavorable estimate of the Reformers, whether just or unjust, is unquestionably gaining ground among our advanced thinkers."

James Anthony Froude, Short Studies on Great Subjects, Times of Erasmus and Luther, vol. i. p. 48. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1884.

SCHAFF-HERZOG: Condoned bigamy

"Here we may mention his [Luther's] attitude towards the second marriage of Philip of Hesse. This prince, loving another woman than his wife, secured the opinion from the Reformer that while monogamy was the original institution of God, cases might arise to justify bigamy; but the second marriage should, for prudential reasons, be kept secret. The marriage took place March 3, 1540, in the presence of Melanchthon."

Schaff–Herzog Dictionary, article on Luther.

TYTLER: A dispensation for polygamy

"While the tenets of Luther were rapidly gaining ground in the North, the following fact will convince us that he ar-

rogated to himself an authority very little short of that of the Pope in Germany. Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, had taken a disgust at his wife, a princess of the house of Saxony, who, he alleged, was intolerably ugly and addicted to drunkenness. The secret was that he had fallen in love with a young lady of the name of Saal, whom he wanted to marry. Luther at this time, with five of his followers, was holding a kind of synod at Wittenberg, for the regulation of matters regarding the Church. The Landgrave presented to him a petition, setting forth his case, in which he at the same time insinuated that in case Luther and the doctors should refuse him a dispensation of polygamy he should perhaps be obliged to ask it of the Pope. The synod were under considerable difficulty. The interest of the Landgrave was too considerable to be disregarded, and at the same time, to favor him, they must assume to themselves a power of breaking a law of Scripture. The temporal consideration was more powerful than the spiritual one. They agreed to give Philip a dispensation for polygamy, and he accordingly

married his favorite, — even with the consent of his former wife."

Tytler, Universal History, vol. iv. book vi. ch. xx. p. 290. New York: Harper Bros., Pub., 1857.

SCHAFF-HERZOG: Calvin's intolerance

"It is idle to shield Calvin from the charge of bringing about Servetus' death, . . . but at the same time it is easy to excuse him on the ground of the persecuting spirit of the age. Strange as it may seem, the Protestants who had felt the persecutions of Rome were ready to persecute all who followed not with them."

Schaff-Herzog Dictionary, article on Calvin.

HALLAM: Knox advocated persecution

"In a conversation with Maitland, he [Knox] asserted most explicitly the duty of putting idolaters to death. Nothing can be more sanguinary than the Reformer's spirit in this extraordinary interview. St. Dominick could not have surpassed him. It is strange to see men professing all the time our modern creed of charity and toleration extol these sanguinary spirits of the sixteenth century."

Hallam, Const. History of England, vol. i. ch. iii. p. 147 n.

JOHN KNOX: A reformer's idea of toleration

"While the posterity of Abraham," says Knox, "were few in number, and while they sojourned in different countries, they were merely required to avoid all participation in the idolatrous rites of the heathen; but as soon as they prospered into a kingdom, and had obtained possession of Canaan, they were strictly charged to suppress idolatry, and to destroy all the monuments and incentives. The same duty was now incumbent on the professors of the true religion in Scotland: formerly, when not more than ten persons in a country were enlightened, it would have been foolishness to have demanded of the nobility the suppression of idolatry. But now when knowledge had been increased," etc.

Quoted in Dr. M'Crie's Life of John Knox, vol. ii. p. 122.

XIII

THE REFORMATION AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Decide all controversy by
Infallible artillery;
And prove their doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks;
Call fire and sword and desolation
A godly-thorough-Reformation.

BUTLER: *Hudibras.*

TO what does the world of to-day owe such religious liberty as it possesses? Certainly to no principle or tendency born of the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century. The Spanish Inquisition was not abolished until 1814. Catholic emancipation from the persecution of English Protestantism did not transpire until 1829. The nineteenth century came, but the laws of Saxony, disqualifying Catholics from holding property, still persisted in the "cradle of the Reformation." Down to 1850 it was still a capital offence

for any Catholic clergyman to cross the Danish frontier; down to 1876 only Protestants could hold office in New Hampshire; and even in our own day no Catholic may hold an office of trust or honor in Sweden. The Protestant Reformation sought to substitute one form of orthodoxy for another. The old orthodoxy fought for its life; if Protestantism triumphed, it knew that the rack and the fagot would be its fate. Religious hate and suspicion were engendered, and persecutions followed as a natural consequence. Religious liberty came only after the Reformation movement had run its course, and freedom of conscience is a *reaction* rather than a *result*.

Luther taught and preached the propriety and need of religious persecution. So did Calvin. The heavy treatise that the latter wrote on the "Punishment of Heretics" may still be consulted by any reader who wishes to study the arguments justifying the burning of human beings for religious differences. Luther had his victim in Karlstadt, whom he banished and exiled. Calvin had his victim in Servetus, whom he decoyed to Geneva and burned.

These apostles were zealously followed in this particular by all their disciples. Beza, in France, and the leading English churchmen, even down to the eighteenth century, were believers in the right and duty of persecution for religious convictions.[1]

The policy of nations was guided by that belief. The first condition of religious intolerance — a union of Church and State — was taken at the start by every country which adopted Protestantism. The triumph of the Reformation was always marked by the immediate promulgation of laws against Catholics and dissenters. This was the case in Hesse and Saxony; under Gustavus Vasa in Sweden; under Elizabeth in England; and under the House of Orange in the Netherlands.

The colonists of Massachusetts, fleeing from religious tyranny, — and of whom we might naturally expect they would spurn that

[1] An article in the Westminster Confession of Faith (CXXII. p. 86, ed. 1845) asserts that "the civil magistrate hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed."

which had exiled them, — were yet so imbued with the cult of the Reformation time that they re-enacted on American soil the odious intolerance of their mother country. Quakers were imprisoned, Baptists were banished, and "Papists" were pilloried and tortured. Men had to forget the unnatural feelings born of the Reformation time, and to revert to natural common-sense before they concluded to give up persecution. The hates, the envies, and the prejudices of the religious upheaval had to be cleared away before men's minds could calmly arrive at an earnest desire for toleration. When there is an outcropping of the old spirit, we may be sure that it is a reversion to what has been termed the "fury of the Reformation time." [1]

LECKY: Catholic and Protestant persecution

"Catholicism was an ancient Church. She had gained a great part of her influ-

[1] "It is very strange and very humiliating for human reason that when the middle age had vanished; when Charron and Montaigne had just written those books so impregnated with the spirit of scepticism, precisely then, in the full light of the sixteenth century, persecution of sorcerers entered on the most violent phase." (Rambaud, History of Civilization, vol. i. p. 571, Paris, 1883.)

ence by vast services to mankind. She rested avowedly on the principle of authority. She was defending herself against aggression and innovation. . . . She might point to the priceless blessings she had bestowed upon humanity, to the slavery she had destroyed, to the civilization she had founded, to the many generations she had led with honor to the grave. She might show how completely her doctrines were interwoven with the whole social system, how fearful would be the convulsion if they were destroyed, and how absolutely incompatible they were with the acknowledgment of private judgment. These considerations would not make her blameless, but they would, at least, palliate her guilt."

"But what shall we say of a church that was but a thing of yesterday; a church that had as yet no services to show, no claims upon the gratitude of mankind; a church that was by profession the creature of private judgment, and was in reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which nevertheless suppressed by force a worship that multitudes deemed necessary to salvation; which by all her

organs and with all her energies persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers? What shall we say of a religion which comprised at most but a fourth part of the Christian world, and which the first explosion of private judgment had shivered into countless sects, which was nevertheless so pervaded by the spirit of dogmatism that each of these sects asserted its distinctive doctrines with the same confidence, and persecuted with the same unhesitating violence, as a church which was venerable with the homage of twelve centuries? . . . So strong and so general was its intolerance that for some time it may, I believe, be truly said that there were more instances of partial toleration being advocated by Roman Catholics than by orthodox Protestants."

Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, vol. i. p. 51, ed. 1870.

GUIZOT: Violation of conscience

"The Reformation of the sixteenth century was not aware of the true principles of intellectual liberty. . . . On the one side it did not know or respect all the

rights of human thought; at the very moment it was demanding these rights for itself it was violating them toward others. On the other hand it was unable to estimate the rights of authority in the matters of reason."

Guizot, History of Civilization, pp. 261–262.

HAZLITT: Protestant persecution

"It is evident, moreover, . . . that the Reformers, just as much as the Papists, held it a right to inflict coercion, physical pains, and death upon those who denied what they regarded as the essential faith; it was a century and a half before Protestants learned definitely that they had no right to inflict death, imprisonment, stripes, or fines upon heretics. . . . Calvin burnt Servetus for heresy; the mild Melanchthon approved the act; so did Bucer. (Calv. Epist. p. 147, Genoa, 1575.) Calvin, in his letter to the Earl of Somerset, Lord Primate of England (Epist. 67), speaking of the Papists and of the fanatic sect of "Gospellers," says expressively, "they ought to be repressed by the avenging sword." Speaking of executions in England for re-

ligious opinions, Hazlitt says: "It appears many were put to death in the reign of Henry VIII.; some in the time of Edward VI.; one hundred and sixty Roman Catholics in the reign of Elizabeth; sixteen or seventeen in that of James; and more than twenty by the Presbyterians and Republicans."

Hazlitt, notes to his edition of Guizot's History of Civilization, pp. 266–267.

HALLAM: "The deadly original sin"

"Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed churches; that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive."

Hallam, Constitutional History of England, vol. i. ch. ii. p. 105.

STRICKLAND: Persecution upheld by all

"It is a lamentable trait in human nature that there was not a sect established at the Reformation that did not avow, as part of their religious duty, the horrible necessity of destroying some of their fellow-creatures

on account of what they severally termed heretical tenets."

Strickland, Queens of England.

BRYCE: Inconsistency and intolerance

"The will of the sovereign, as in England, or the will of the majority, as in Holland, Scandinavia, and Scotland, imposed upon each country a peculiar form of worship, and kept up the practices of mediæval intolerance without their justification. Persecution, which might be at least excused in an infallible Catholic and Apostolic Church, was peculiarly odious when practised by those who were not Catholic, who were no more apostolic than their neighbors, and who had just revolted from the most ancient and venerable authority in the name of rights which they now denied to others."

Bryce, Holy Roman Empire, ch. xviii. p. 328.

GIBBON: Reformers defended persecution

"The patriot reformers were ambitious of succeeding the tyrants whom they had dethroned. They imposed, with equal vigor, their creeds and confessions; they asserted

the right of the magistrate to punish the heretic with death."

Gibbon, Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. liv.

MACAULAY: Dishonest as well as intolerant

"Rome had at least prescription on its side. But Protestant intolerance, despotism in an upstart sect, infallibility claimed by guides who acknowledge that they had passed the greater part of their lives in error, restraints imposed on the liberty of private judgment at the pleasure of rulers who could vindicate their own proceedings only by asserting the liberty of private judgment, — these things could not long be borne. Those who had pulled down the crucifix could not long continue to persecute for the surplice. It required no great sagacity to perceive the inconsistency and dishonesty of men who, dissenting from almost all Christendom, would suffer none to dissent from themselves; who demanded freedom of conscience, yet refused to grant it; who execrated persecution, yet persecuted; who urged reason against the authority of one

opponent, and authority against the reason of another."

Macaulay's Essays, "Hampden."

MACAULAY: Protestants persecuted each other

"In the Palatinate a Calvinistic prince persecuted the Lutherans. In Saxony a Lutheran prince persecuted the Calvinists. Everybody who objected to any of the articles of the Confession of Augsburg was banished from Sweden. In Scotland Melville was disputing with other Protestants on questions of ecclesiastical government. In England the jails were filled with men who, though zealous for the Reformation, did not exactly agree with the Court on all points of discipline and doctrine. Some were persecuted for denying the tenet of reprobation; some for not wearing surplices."

Macaulay's Essays (Review of Von Ranke's Hist. of Popes).

LECKY: Intolerance of the Scotch and Swedes

"When the Reformation triumphed in Scotland, one of its first fruits was a law

prohibiting any priest from celebrating, or any worshipper from hearing mass, under pain of the confiscation of his goods for the first offence, of exile for the second, and of death for the third. That the Queen of Scotland should be permitted to hear mass in her own private chapel was publicly denounced as an intolerable evil. 'One mass,' exclaimed Knox, 'is more fearful to me than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in part of the realm.' In France, when the government of certain towns was conceded to the Protestants, they immediately employed their power to suppress absolutely the Catholic worship, to prohibit any Protestant from attending a marriage or a funeral that was celebrated by a priest, to put down all mixed marriages, and to prosecute to the full extent of their power those who had abandoned their creed. In Sweden, all who dissented from any article of the Confession of Augsburg were at once banished. As late as 1690 a synod was held at Amsterdam, consisting partly of Dutch and partly of French and English ministers, who were driven to Holland by persecution, and in that synod the doctrine

that the magistrate has no right to crush heresy and idolatry by the civil power was unanimously pronounced to be 'false, scandalous, and pernicious.' "

Lecky's Rationalism in Europe, vol. ii. pp. 49–50.

BUCKLE: Scotch bigotry worse than French

"It must be admitted that in Scotland there is more bigotry, more superstition, and a more thorough contempt for the religion of others, than there is in France. And in Sweden, which is one of the oldest Protestant countries in Europe, there is, not occasionally but habitually, an intolerance and a spirit of persecution which would be discreditable to a Catholic country, but which is doubly disgraceful when proceeding from a people who profess to base their religion on the right of private judgment."

Buckle, History of Civilization in England, vol. i. p. 264.

GREEN: In England

"The suffering of the Protestants had failed to teach them the worth of religious liberty; and a new code of ecclesiastical

laws, which was ordered to be drawn up by a board of commissioners as a substitute for the Canon Law of the Catholic Church, although it shrank from the penalty of death, attached that of perpetual imprisonment or exile to the crimes of heresy, blasphemy, and adultery, and declared excommunication to involve a severance of the offender from the mercy of God and his deliverance into the tyranny of the devil."

Green, History of the English People, etc., book vi., ch. i., "The Reformation," p. 226.

GREEN: "Heretics ought to be put to death"

"The spirit of Calvinistic Presbyterianism excluded all toleration of practice or belief. . . . For heresy there was to be the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. 'I deny,' wrote Cartwright, 'that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death. Heretics ought to be put to death now.'"

Id., book vi., ch. v., "England and the Papacy."

GREEN: The policy of the Huguenots

"If the Protestant lords in Scotland had been driven to assert a right of nonconformity, if the Huguenots of France were following their example, it was with no thought of asserting the right of every man to worship God as he would. From the claim of such a right, Knox or Coligni would have shrunk with even greater horror than Elizabeth. What they aimed at was simply the establishment of a truce till, by force or persuasion, they could win the realms that tolerated them for their own."

Green, History of the English People, etc., book vi., ch. iii., "England of Elizabeth."

FISHER: Milton's "liberality"

"Even Milton, it may be observed here, did not carry his doctrine of liberty of conscience so far as to lead him to favor the toleration of the mass and other ceremonies of Roman Catholic worship, which, as being idolatrous, he thought should be forbidden."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xv.

XIV

THE REFORMATION AND CIVIL LIBERTY

The splendid empire of Charles V. [1546–1555] *was erected on the grave of liberty.*

MOTLEY.

THE denial of free will by the early Protestants, and Luther's exaggeration of the obedience due princes, were tendencies adverse to progress in civil liberty; but their influence was slight compared with that of other circumstances growing out of the conflict of creeds.

No inconsiderable progress had been made in political freedom at the epoch when Luther appeared. In England, France, Spain, and Germany, we find Parliaments, States General, Cortes, and Diets. The people had acquired representative forms. The ancient liberties of England were formulated in the Magna Charta;

there was trial by jury and there was the *habeas corpus*. Free cities flourished; and in Italy, the Republics of Genoa, Venice, Sienna, Florence, and Pisa conserved great popular liberties. With the natural momentum of progress and the art of printing, there should have been no halt or retrogression.

Unhappily, this was precisely what occurred after the Protestant movement was fairly launched. In some instances, popular excesses, the revolts of the Anabaptists, and the anarchy caused by the new teaching led to a reaction towards strong government. In other places the reformers courted the support of the princes and kings by clothing them with religious authority taken from the Pope. The prince, uniting the authority of head of the State and head of the Church, became absolute and uncurbed.

This was the case in England, where the Parliament showed itself the pliant tool of Henry VIII., and where James I. proclaimed the doctrine of kingly divine right. It explains the unequalled absolutism of the Lutheran princes of Germany and the King

of Prussia, even as late as the eighteenth century. The same train of events blotted out all representative forms in Denmark under Frederick III. in 1669, and in Sweden under Charles XI. in 1680.

In fact, Protestantism and absolutism were simultaneous eras. A century after Luther, representative government had fallen into decay. Strong centralized monarchies ruled all Europe, — in France by virtue of the religious wars, and in Spain by reason of contagious example abroad.

The liberty of the press, which was little restricted during the first half-century of printing, becomes the subject of close surveillance in the epochs of religious conflict ensuing. The freedom with which Erasmus criticises princes in the early portion of the sixteenth century is punished as sedition in the seventeenth. Milton makes a timid and unavailing plea for more liberty; yet things have only slightly bettered even a hundred years after Milton.

We might naturally expect that in the turmoil of religious conflict there would be a notable loss of respect for life and property. The persecution of recusants and the confis-

cation of church property were not without a demoralizing influence on the safety of human life and the security of all kinds of property. Law and liberty go hand in hand. In the midst of civil conflict and religious hatred the conditions for progress in political freedom, were decidedly unfavorable. There was universal regress, and then slow recovery. Civil liberty made greater strides in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century than in all the three hundred years preceding.

GUIZOT: Unfavorable to free institutions

"In Germany, far from demanding political liberty, the Reformation accepted, I shall not say servitude, but the absence of liberty [p. 259]. . . . It rather strengthened than enfeebled the power of princes; it was rather opposed to the free institutions of the middle ages than favorable to their progress [p. 258]. . . . In England it consented to the existence of a church as full of abuses as ever the Romish Church had been, and much more servile [p. 259]. . . . It doubtless left the mind subject to all the chances of liberty or thral-

dom which might arise from political institutions."

Guizot, History of Civilization, pp. 258, 259.

HALLAM: Withdrew liberty of judgment

"The adherents to the Church of Rome have never failed to cast two reproaches on those who left them: one, that the Reform was brought about by intemperate and calumnious abuse, by outrages of an excited populace, or by the tyranny of princes; the other, that, after stimulating the most ignorant to reject the authority of their Church, it instantly withdrew this liberty of judgment and devoted all who presumed to swerve from the line drawn by law to virulent obloquy and sometimes to bonds and death. These reproaches, it may be a shame to us to own, can be uttered and *cannot be refuted*."

Introduction to the History of Literature, vol. i. p. 200, sec. 34.

BRYCE: Excesses of fantastic sects

"The remark must not be omitted, in passing, how much less than might have

been expected the religious movement did at first actually effect in the way of promoting either political progress or freedom of conscience. The habits of centuries were not to be unlearned in a few years, and it was natural that ideas struggling into existence and activity should work erringly and imperfectly for a time. By a few inflammable minds liberty was carried into antinomianism, and produced the wildest excesses of life and doctrine. Several fantastic sects arose, refusing to conform to the ordinary rules without which human society could not subsist."

Bryce, Holy Roman Empire, ch. xviii. p. 326.

SCHLEGEL: Luther favored absolutism

"Luther was by no means an advocate for democracy . . . but he asserted the absolute power of princes, though he made his advocacy subservient to his own religious views and projects. It was by such conduct and the influence which he thereby acquired, as well as by the sanction of the civil power, that the Reformation was promoted and consolidated. Without this,

Protestantism would have sunk into the lawless anarchy which marked the proceedings of the Hussites, and to which the war of the peasants rapidly tended, and it would have been inevitably suppressed, like all other popular commotions."

Schlegel, Philosophy of History, vol. ii. p. 205: Appleton, New York, Publisher.

GREEN: Constitutional guards swept away

"The one great institution which could still offer resistance to the royal will was struck down. The Church became a mere instrument of the central despotism. The people learned their helplessness in rebellions easily suppressed and avenged with ruthless severity. A reign of terror, organized with consummate and merciless skill, held England panic-stricken at Henry's feet. The noblest heads rolled on the block. Virtue and learning could not save Thomas More; royal descent could not save Lady Salisbury. The execution of queen after queen taught England that nothing was too high for Henry's 'courage' or too sacred for his 'appetite.' Parliament assembled only to

sanction acts of unscrupulous tyranny, or to build up by its own statutes the great fabric of absolute rule. All the constitutional safeguards of English freedom were swept away. Arbitrary taxation, arbitrary legislation, arbitrary imprisonment were powers claimed without dispute and unsparingly exercised by the Crown."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vi. ch. i.

MACAULAY: Absolutism in England

"The immediate effect of the Reformation in England was by no means favorable to political liberty. The authority which had been exercised by the Popes was transferred almost entire to the King. Two formidable powers, which had often served to check each other, were united in a single despot. If the system on which the founders of the Church of England acted could have been permanent, the Reformation would have been, in a political sense, the greatest curse that ever fell on our country."

Macaulay's Essays, "Hampden."

SCHLEGEL: Civil liberty suffered

"Not only freedom of thought, but civil liberty also suffered much in many states of Europe, and especially in Germany from the religious schism. In this country the revolt of the peasants and the discontent of the nobles were the pretext; the power of the princes, so augmented by the confiscation of church property and their own close alliance with each other, was the cause of these numerous restrictions upon ancient freedom."

Schlegel, Lectures on Modern History (Lectures 15 and 16), p. 209.

GREEN: Political chaos in England

"All that men saw was political and religious chaos, in which ecclesiastical order had perished, and in which politics was dying down into the squabbles of a knot of nobles over the spoils of the church and crown."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vi. ch. i., "The Reformation."

ALLISON: Evil social results

Sir A. Allison, in his "History of Europe," says: "The great sin of the Reformation was the confiscation of so large a portion of the property of the Church for the aggrandizement of temporal ambition and the enriching of the nobility who had taken a part in the struggle. Almost all the social evils under which Great Britain is now laboring may be traced to this fatal and most iniquitous spoliation, under the mask of religion, of the patrimony of the poor on the occasion of the Reformation."

Allison, Hist. of Europe.

GREEN: Oppression of the poor

"In 1549 Devonshire demanded, by open revolt, the restoration of the mass and the Six Articles, as well as a partial re-establishment of the suppressed abbeys. The Agrarian discontent woke again in general disorder. Enclosures and evictions were going steadily on, and the bitterness of the change was being heightened by the results of the dissolution of the abbeys. Church

lands had always been underlet, the monks were easy landlords, and on no estates had the peasantry been as yet so much exempt from the general revolution in culture. But the new lay masters, to whom the abbey lands fell, were quick to reap their full value by a rise of rents, and by the same processes of eviction and enclosure as went on elsewhere."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vi. ch. i.

GREEN: Anarchy in Ireland

"While the reckless energy of the reformers brought England to the verge of chaos it brought Ireland to the verge of rebellion."

Id., book vi. ch. i.

XV

TWO POLITICAL THEORIES OF THE REFORMATION TIME

There 's such divinity doth hedge a king,
That treason can but peep to what it would.
SHAKESPEARE: *Hamlet.*

THAT kings hold their power directly from God, and consequently are responsible to Him only for their acts, is, in substance, the doctrine of "the divine and indefeasible right of kings." The teaching of the Catholic and Papal theologians made monarchs responsible to the people from whom they immediately held their authority. Louis of Bavaria, in his struggle against the Pope, was the first strong advocate of the divine-right theory. To bolster up his authority against the censures of Rome, he sought to read his title direct from the Deity rather than through the good graces of his Christian subjects.

The rise of the great monarchies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made this mischievous theory really formidable. When James I. published his plea for what Pope wittily calls

"The right divine of Kings to govern wrong,"

he was ably answered by the Jesuit theologian Suarez. The theologians saw in the divine right of kings a piece of hypocritical politics aiming at the destruction of the Church's spiritual independence and the substitution of Cæsarism and absolutism.

So the theory operated in the case of Louis XIV., with his autocratic boast, "*L'état c'est moi.*" He made it the basis for usurping Papal prerogatives. Finally, democracy has come round to the views of the churchmen on the subject, and the people-king is the only custodian of divine rights recognized in our day.

The principle, *Cujus regio, ejus religio*, is the expressive Latin of a peace plan adopted at the treaty of Augsburg, in 1555, and indorsed nearly a hundred years later at the treaty of Westphalia. The religion

of the prince or elector of a state was to determine the religion of his subjects. Menzel describes this principle as "a result of Luther's well-known policy." The reformers succeeded in all cases by winning the civil authority on their side at the beginning. To enforce the religion of the prince upon his subjects always brought on a struggle, and it was needful to lay hold of a plan like that asserted in *Cujus regio, ejus religio.* In one instance — that of Pfalz — the religion of the people was changed arbitrarily four times within eighty years by reason of this principle. Its survival in Germany, especially among the Lutheran princes, is a noticeable circumstance even to-day. Yet there never was a theory more odious, both in the light of civil and of religious liberty.

MAINE: A Reformation theory

"It is notorious that as soon as the decay of the feudal system had thrown the mediæval constitutions out of working order, and when the Reformation had discredited the authority of the Pope, the doctrine of the divine right of kings rose

immediately into an importance which had never before attended it."

Henry Sumner Maine, Ancient Law, p. 334.

MACAULAY: Not a mediæval doctrine

"In the middle ages the doctrine of indefeasible hereditary right would have been regarded as heretical; for it was altogether incompatible with the high pretension of the Church of Rome."

Macaulay, History of England, vol. i. p. 56.

FISHER: On the Protestant side

"It is remarkable that in opposition to these novel dogmas [of the Jesuits] there appeared on the Protestant side a theory of the divine right of kings and the related doctrine of passive obedience. . . . The advocates of freedom and revolt against spiritual authority are equally strenuous for slavish maxims of political obedience."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xiv. pp. 505–506.

XVI

THE REFORMATION AND LITERATURE

To the universities the Reformation brought desolation. — FROUDE.

THE revival of literature was well under way when the Protestant Reformation burst forth. Printing, paper manufacture, the fall of Constantinople, and the discovery of America were four important impulses to progress that had transpired during the latter half of the fifteenth century.

In literature and art Europe was decidedly moving forward. The Reformation, largely from the nature of the case and incidentally by reason of its teachings, tended to retard this literary and intellectual advancement.

1. It was a revolution accompanied everywhere by turmoil and disorder. Force, rather than reason, decided the

fate of the conflict. Cabals and plots, surprises and *coup d'états*, wars, sieges, and massacres, were the events of the day. These conditions have never favored literary and intellectual progress at any period of the world's history. Men's minds are drawn away from the pursuits of peace, the culture of the arts and the sciences, the upbuilding of useful knowledge. There is no stability of national desire. The concern of every man is for the protection of the goods he has — life and property — rather than for acquisition and improvement.

2. Such literature as most prevailed in the Reformation period was of the controversial order; and this, not scholarly or valuable, but fashioned after the pattern set by Luther, — rough, violent, disputatious, and bad-tempered. The literary field was overgrown with this kind of weed, and seemingly sterile to the production of aught else.

3. For nearly fifty years (1520–70) England produced no literature of notable value, and in Germany the sterility and blight in letters lasted for two hundred

years after Luther. Not until the time of Leibnitz did Germany begin to repossess a literature.

4. The breaking up of the monasteries, which constituted the common-school system of the middle ages, had an unfavorable effect on literature as well as upon the intelligence of the masses.

There was everywhere a falling off in the attendance at the universities. The essential importance of these nurseries of learning was never greater, relatively, than at the time of the Reformation. Their injury was the hurt of everything intellectual throughout Europe.

5. Certain forms of Protestantism were distinctly unfavorable to literature. The Anabaptists burned libraries and decried education. Calvinism warred on art and poetry, as frivolous and diabolical. Among the Puritans there was a dislike for all kinds of human learning which were not Biblical or theological in their purposes.

The theatre was an abomination; and the study of the classics — to which England owed her literary renaissance — was likened unto the pursuit of false gods.

6. Growing out of the suspicion and hate of warring creeds, stricter censorship was established over the press.[1] Books were condemned and suppressed. Authors were constrained to tell half truths. Criticism was gagged. The heterodox in politics and science was punished equally with the heterodox in religion. There was far greater freedom of thought and speech in the Europe of the fifteenth century than in the Europe of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

HALLAM: Reformation appealed to the ignorant

"The most striking effect of the first preaching of the Reformation was that it appealed to the ignorant."

Hallam, Int. to Literature of Europe, vol. i. p. 181.

[1] There were many curbs on the liberty of the press during Elizabeth's reign. "In 1559," says Strype, "by the Queen's injunction, no one might print any book or paper whatever, unless the same was first licensed by the royal council or by the ordinary. By a decree of the Star Chamber no one was to print under the penalty of a year's imprisonment, except in London and in either of the two universities. No one was to print any book, matter, or thing whatever, until it shall have been seen and allowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London, and every one selling books printed contrary to this regulation is to suffer three months' imprisonment."

FROUDE: Goethe's opinion

"A greater man than either Macaulay or Buckle — the German poet, Goethe — says of Luther that he threw back the intellectual progress of mankind for centuries by calling in the passions of the multitude to decide on subjects which ought to have been left to the learned. Goethe in saying this was alluding especially to Erasmus. Goethe thought that Erasmus and men like Erasmus had struck on the right track, and if they could have retained the direction of the mind of Europe there would have been more truth and less falsehood among us at this present time. The party hatreds, the theological rivalries, the persecutions, the civil wars, the religious animosities which have so long distracted us, would have been all avoided and the mind of mankind would have expanded gradually and equably with the growth of knowledge."

James Anthony Froude, Lecture on the Times of Luther and Erasmus (Short Studies on Great Subjects), vol. i. p. 48.

GREEN: In England

Among the effects of the Reformation in England during Edward VI.'s reign,

Green notes that "divinity ceased to be taught in the universities; students had fallen off in numbers; libraries were scattered and burned; and the intellectual impulse had died away."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vi. ch. i. p. 367.

FROUDE: In Edward VI.'s reign

"Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned. The divinity schools were planted with cabbages, and the Oxford laundresses dried clothes in the schools of art."

Froude, History of England, vol. v. ch. v.

GREEN: At the universities

"Classical learning, indeed, all but perished at the universities in the storm of the Reformation, nor did it revive here till the close of Elizabeth's reign."

Green, book vi. ch. vii. ("England of Shakespeare").

FISHER: A censorship over books

"In Protestant countries, after the Reformation, the supervision of the printing and circulation of books devolved upon

the State. A tiring and meddlesome censorship and sometimes a severe penal code were established by various governments."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xv. p. 527.

MATTHEW ARNOLD: A literary estimate

Matthew Arnold (Schools and Universities of the Continent, p. 154), speaks of the Elizabethan literature as the work of "men of the Renaissance, not men of the Reformation." Taine, in his "History of English Literature," entitles his chapter on the Elizabethan age "The Pagan Renaissance."

MOTLEY: In the Netherlands

Motley describes the iconoclastic movements of the Reformation in the Netherlands. "The Netherlands," he says, "possessed an extraordinary number of churches and monasteries. Their exquisite architecture and elaborate decoration had been the earliest indication of intellectual culture displayed in the country. All that science could invent, all that art could embody, all that mechanical ingenuity could dare, all that wealth could lavish, —

all gathered round these magnificent temples. . . . And now, for the space of only six or seven days and nights, there raged a storm by which all these treasures were destroyed. Nearly every one of these temples were rifled of their contents. Art must forever weep over this bereavement. . . . The mob rose in the night in Antwerp, and began by wrecking the great cathedral church of Our Lady, and before morning they sacked thirty churches within the walls. . . . They destroyed seventy chapels, forced open all the chests of treasure, covered their own squalid attire with the gorgeous robes of the ecclesiastics, and burned the splendid missals and manuscripts. . . . Hardly a statue or picture escaped destruction. The number of churches desecrated has never been counted. In the single province of Flanders four hundred were sacked."

Motley, Rise of the Dutch Republic, vol. i. ch. vii.

BUCKLE: Unfavorable to learning

"For, though the Protestant Reformation was a consequence of this progress [revival of learning], it was for some time

unfavorable to it, by encouraging the ablest men in the discussion of questions inaccessible to human reason, and thus diverting them from subjects in which their efforts would have been available for the general purposes of civilization. Hence we find that little was really accomplished until the end of the sixteenth century, when the theological fervor began to subside in England and France, and the way was prepared for that purely secular philosophy of which Bacon and Descartes were the exponents, but by no means the creators."

Buckle, History of Civilization in England, vol. i. p. 329.

ERASMUS: "Literature languishes"

A contemporary of Luther, the learned Erasmus, testified in 1528: "Wherever Lutheranism reigns, there literature utterly perishes." (Quoted by Hallam, Lit. of Europe, vol. i. p. 165.) In the same year he wrote in another letter: "I dislike these gospellers on many accounts, but chiefly because, through their agency, literature languishes, disappears, lies drooping, and perishes; and yet, without learning, what

is men's life? They love good cheer and a wife; for other things they care not a straw." In a letter to Melanchthon he states that "at Strasburg the Protestant party had publicly taught, in 1524, that it was not right to cultivate any science, and that no language should be studied except the Hebrew."

Epistle 714.

PRESCOTT: Iconoclasm broke loose

"The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed. The structures so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect. But who can estimate the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary, and paintings? It is a melancholy fact that the earliest efforts of the reformers were everywhere directed against those monuments of genius which had been created and cherished by the generous patronage of Catholicism."

Prescott, Philip II.

XVII

"BLOODY MARY" AND "GOOD QUEEN BESS"

I think the truth is, she was not half so good as she had been made out and not half so bad as she had been made out. — DICKENS (*on Queen Elizabeth*).

THESE expressions give us are markable illustration of how religious animosity may color history. The unimpeachable truth is that Mary was at least as good as Elizabeth, and Elizabeth was at least as bloody as Mary.

Both royal ladies persecuted, but with this difference: Mary persecuted Protestants, and Elizabeth persecuted Catholics. In our day either kind of persecution is equally wrong and reprehensible. Not so in other and less tolerant days. The age that coined these expressions thought Mary "bloody" for the killing she did, but it thought Bess "good" because she did her

killing on the other side. Judgments which depend upon "whose ox is gored" are of no historical value. Adjectives like "good" and "bloody," based on such judgments, are little better.

The victims of Mary's persecution numbered two hundred and eighty-four, according to Burnett; two hundred and eighty-eight, according to Strype; "above two hundred," says Miss Strickland, and "almost two hundred," according to Lingard. They were chiefly laymen, few clergymen suffering death.

The Catholic victims under Elizabeth amounted to one hundred and ninety-one according to Dodd, and to two hundred and four according to Milner.[1] "Many others," says Hallam, "died of hardship in prison." Lingard ascertains from contemporary lists

[1] "It is probable that not many more than two hundred Catholics were executed, as such, in Elizabeth's reign, and this was ten score too many. — Dodd reckons them at 191; Milner has raised the list to 204. Fifteen of these, according to him, suffered for denying the Queen's supremacy, 126 for exercising their ministry, and the rest for being reconciled to the Romish Church. Many others died of hardships in prison, and many were deprived of their property." — J. L. Motley, Hist. of the United Netherlands, ch. xvii. with footnote.

that one hundred and twenty-four Catholic priests were executed. Challoner thinks that the number of priests alone who suffered death was nearly two hundred. Many hundred recusants died in prison.

Mary's persecution lasted four years; Elizabeth's, forty-four. The fines for recusancy, the banishments, the imprisonments, and torture which characterize Elizabeth's reign are more impressive of the horrors of persecution than even the hangings and burnings at Tyburn. Strype tells us that at one of the assizes in Hampshire four hundred recusants were presented, and at another in Lancashire, six hundred. Bridgewater states that at one time twenty Catholic recusants died of infectious disease in York Castle.

"The rack seldom stood idle in the tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign," says Hallam. "Such excessive severities," he continues, "under the pretext of treason, but sustained by very little evidence of any other offence than the exercise of Catholic ministry, excited indignation throughout a good part of Europe." [1]

[1] Const. History of England, vol. i. p. 201.

As to the comparative characters of Mary and Elizabeth, Miss Strickland's "Queens of England" seems to place a much higher estimation on that of the former than on the latter.

MACAULAY: Mary had provocation

"The Catholics did not, at the time of Elizabeth's accession, rise in arms to seat a pretender to the throne. But before Mary had given or could give provocation, the most distinguished Protestants attempted to set aside her rights in favor of the Lady Jane. That attempt and the subsequent insurrection of Wyatt furnished as good a plea for the burning of Protestants as the conspiracies of Mary against Elizabeth furnish for the hanging and embowelling of Papists."

Macaulay's Essays, "Hallam."

SOUTHEY: Mary had some excuse

"If any person may be excused for hating the Reformation, it was Mary. She regarded it as having arisen in this country from her mother's wrongs, and enabled the king to complete an iniquitous and cruel divorce.

It had her exposed to inconvenience and even danger under her father's reign, to vexation and restraint under her brother; and, after having been bastardized in consequence of it, an attempt had been made to deprive her of the inheritance, because she continued to profess the Roman Catholic faith."

R. Southey, Book of the Church, ch. xiv.

HALLAM: Mary's respect for the constitution

"It is due, indeed, to the memory of one who has left so odious a name, to remark that Mary was conscientiously averse to encroach upon what she understood to be the privileges of her people. A wretched book having been written to exalt her prerogative on the ridiculous pretence that, as queen, she was not bound by the laws of former kings, she showed it to Gardiner, and on his expressing his indignation at the sophism, threw it herself into the fire."

Hallam, Constitutional Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 55.

GREEN: In Elizabeth's reign

"To modern eyes there is something even more revolting than open persecution in a policy which branded every Catholic priest as a traitor and all Catholic worship as disloyal. . . . An act to retain the Queen's Majesty's subjects in due obedience prohibited the saying of mass even in private houses, increased the fine on recusants to twenty pounds a month, etc. . . . If we adopt the Catholic estimate of the times, the twenty years which followed [1580–1600] saw the execution of two hundred priests, while a yet greater number perished in filthy and fever-stricken gaols in which they were plunged. The work of reconciliation with Rome was arrested by this ruthless energy."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vi. ch. v., "England and the Papacy."

MACAULAY: Mary and Elizabeth

"Being herself [Queen Elizabeth] an Adiaphorist, having no scruple about conforming to the Romish Church when conformity was necessary to her own safety, retaining to the last moment of her life

a fondness for much of the doctrine and much of the ceremonial of that church, she yet subjected that church to a persecution even more odious than the persecution with which her sister had harassed the Protestants. We say more odious. For Mary had at least the plea of fanaticism. She did nothing for her religion which she was not prepared to suffer for it. She had held it firmly under persecution. She fully believed it to be essential to salvation. If she burned the bodies of her subjects, it was in order to rescue their souls. Elizabeth had no such pretext. In opinion she was little more than half a Protestant. She had professed, when it suited her, to be wholly a Catholic."

Macaulay's Essays, "Burleigh and his Times."

XVIII

THE INQUISITION

In the heroic days when Ferdinand
And Isabella ruled the Spanish land,
And Torquemada, with his subtle brain,
Ruled them, as Grand Inquisitor of Spain.
LONGFELLOW.

TWENTY-TWO thousand persons suffered death for theft in England during the thirty-eight years of a single reign. The justice of our ancestors was a bloody affair.

Sir James Stephen, in his "History of Criminal Law of England" (p. 467), says: "If the average number of executions in each county were twenty, a little more than a quarter of the executions in Devonshire, in 1598, this would make eight hundred executions a year in the forty English counties" — or eighty thousand in the course of a century. Mackay, in a work entitled "Curious Superstitions" (p. 237), says that forty thousand witches were

put to death in England from 1600 to 1680.[1]

The Spanish Inquisition dealt with polygamy, witchcraft, treason, heresy, and a variety of other offences. During the fifteen years that Torquemada was Chief Inquisitor, the historian Mariana says that two thousand executions were reported. Llorente estimates the capital punishments under the Spanish Inquisition at thirty thousand, during the three centuries of its existence. According to Llorente,[2] the Spanish tribunal took cognizance of many crimes besides heresy, — of sins against nature; of ecclesiastical and monastic immoralities; of blasphemy, usury, and sacrilegious theft; of all crimes connected with

[1] Hefele shows that at Nordingen — a Protestant town of Germany, having then a population of six thousand — the authorities burned in four years (1590–94) thirty-five sorcerers. Applying these proportions to Spain, where sorcery was then at least as prevalent, there should have been in four years fifty thousand sorcerers executed in that country; that is, twenty thousand more than Llorente assigns as victims of every kind to the Spanish Inquisition during its career of three hundred and thirty years.

[2] Llorente was an ex-priest and a discharged official of the Inquisition. He had a motive for blackening the institution as much as he could.

the employés or affairs of the tribunal; of traffic in contraband of war, and of every kind of sorcery and superstition.

There are positive complaints of gross inaccuracy against Llorente, and some glaring mistakes are pointed out in his history.[1]

He took a novel method of making an authority of himself. Having obtained custody of the archives of the Inquisition when Joseph Bonaparte captured Madrid, he used select portions, chosen with the avowed intent of blackening its record, and then burnt the original documents so that no future historian could gainsay him from the records.

The Spanish Inquisition is merely a tangible instance of the civil polity that prevailed contemporaneously throughout Europe.[2] There was also a Portuguese

[1] He says, for instance, "that during the first year of its existence [1481] the sole tribunal of Seville burned two thousand, all of whom belonged to the dioceses of Seville and Cadiz." In support of this charge he cites Mariana; but a reference to Mariana shows that the number two thousand includes all the persons executed under Torquemada, and throughout his entire jurisdiction, — that is, in the whole of Castile and Leon, during fifteen years of Torquemada's inquisitorship.

[2] "The Spaniards of the sixteenth century were indisputably the noblest nation of Europe; yet they had the Inquisition and Philip II." (Carlyle.)

Inquisition and a Roman Inquisition. There was a Protestant Inquisition in England under Henry VIII.[1] and Elizabeth, and a Calvinistic Inquisition at Geneva. There was an American colonial Inquisition during the Salem witchcraft. The civil polity of those times made treason to faith a crime against the State.

To determine whether the accused was really guilty of heresy, a tribunal was set up, with priests among the judges. They were theological experts in the employ of the State. The tribunal was regarded as a political institution. Just as witchcraft came before the courts in England and America as a crime against the State, so witchcraft and heresy went before the tribunal called the Inquisition.

[1] Victor Duruy, in his "History of Modern Times" (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1894), says that under Henry VIII. "an inquisition more terrible than that of Spain covered England with funeral piles. Among the victims are counted two queens, two cardinals, three archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors or monks, fourteen archdeacons, sixty canons, more than fifty doctors, twelve dukes, marquises, or earls, twenty-nine barons, three hundred thirty-five nobles, one hundred ten women of rank; *in all, seventy-two thousand capital condemnations.*" (p. 181.)

The Pope, who had consented to the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, eventually found himself at variance with it. Sixtus IV. complained of its severity, and admonished the Spanish monarchs to be more merciful. A later Pope excommunicated the Inquisitors of Toledo; and Papal antipathy kept the institution out of Italy.[1] But this Church hostility did not persuade the Spaniards to give up what they thought a very useful political machine. The spirit of the age was with it. It was founded in a moment of victory over the Moorish invaders, and with the purpose of putting down secret plots of rebellion. Jews, pretending to be Catholic converts, but continuing their ancient religious ceremonies in secret, and cherishing a bitterer hatred of Christianity, were to be ferreted out. It was argued that this was demanded for the sake of the public peace and security; and the Inquisition was deemed the effective means to the end.

[1] "Moreover, he [the Pope] refused to allow the Spanish government to introduce their Inquisition into Naples, or the Milanese, which then belonged to Spain, from his disapprobation of its rigor." — Newman's Lecture on Catholicism in England, p. 202.

The inquisition as a tribunal to examine heretics had first come into existence at the synod of Toulouse, in 1229, when the Albigenses had been put down and all southern France was in a state of disorder.[1] The secret crimes of the Manichæans could be dealt with only, it was argued, by an inquisitorial tribunal composed of men expert in detecting the heretical opinions which prompted such crimes. Thus the first Inquisition commended itself to the law and order party of the middle ages. And its record suggested its usefulness, for their purpose, to Ferdinand and Isabella, when the task of consolidating their reconquered kingdom presented itself. It continued to exist in Spain until abolished

[1] It is said that St. Dominic was the first to propose such a tribunal. For a time none but Dominicans were appointed inquisitors; later, the Franciscans were also appointed. The Spanish Inquisition was established in 1481.

The congregation of Cardinals, known as "The Holy Inquisition," was instituted by Pope Paul III. in 1542.

In France the Inquisition was virtually a state court, until the time of the Reformation. The Court Inquisitor in 1530 was found to be a Calvinist. It was deemed well therefore to transfer the powers of this court to the bishops, which was done about the year 1560.

by Joseph Bonaparte early in the present century.

GUIZOT: A political tribunal

Guizot remarks: "The Inquisition was at first more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order than the defence of faith."

History of Civilization, Lecture 11.

RANKE: The Inquisition a state court

"In the first place, the inquisitors were royal officers. The kings had the right of appointing and dismissing them. . . . The courts of the Inquisition were subject, like other magistracies, to royal visitors. . . . 'Do you not know,' said the king [to Ximenes], 'that if this tribunal possess jurisdiction, it is from the king it derives it?' . . .

"In the second place, all the profit of the confiscations by this court accrued to the king. These were carried out in a very unsparing manner. Though the fueros (privileges) of Aragon forbade the king to confiscate the property of his convicted subjects, he deemed himself exalted above the law in matters pertaining to this court.

. . . The proceeds of these confiscations formed a sort of regular income for the royal exchequer. It was even believed, and asserted from the beginning, that the kings had been moved to establish and countenance this tribunal more by their hankering after the wealth it confiscated than by motives of piety. . . .

"In the third place, it was the Inquisition, and the Inquisition alone, that completely shut out all extraneous interference with the state. The sovereign had now at his disposal a tribunal from which no grandee, no archbishop, could withdraw himself. As Charles knew no other means of bringing certain punishment on the bishops who had taken part in the insurrection of the Communidades (or communes that were struggling for their rights and liberties), he chose to have them judged by the Inquisition. . . .

"It was, in spirit and tendency, a political institution. The Pope had an interest in thwarting it, and he did so; but the king had an interest in constantly upholding it."

Leopold Ranke, The Ottoman and Spanish Empires, pp. 78–79. (Ed. Phila., 1845.)

FISHER: A machine to repress sedition

"The Spanish Inquisition, in its peculiar form, was set up by Ferdinand and Isabella, in the first instance, for the purpose of discovering the converts from Judaism, who returned to their former creed. . . . It was an institution for stifling sedition as well as heresy. Hence it was defended by the Spanish sovereign against objections and complaints of the Pope."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xi. p. 403.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: Its purposes

"In its earlier stage the Inquisition was quite as much a civil as an ecclesiastical tribunal, being especially directed against the exclusive privileges and immunities claimed by the hereditary nobility; and although under Cardinal Ximenes the suppression of heresy became one of its chief functions, it was long regarded with no friendly feelings by Rome."

Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xx. p. 324.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: A political machine

"It was easy for the king [Philip II. of Spain] to employ the forces of one kingdom to crush the liberties of the others. And Philip possessed a formidable weapon in the Inquisition, which he did not scruple to use for secular purposes. Political independence was crushed with the same relentless severity as religious dissent."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xxii. p. 329.

SCHAFF-HERZOG DICTIONARY: Less cruel than some criminal courts of the time

"Hefele, in his 'Life of Ximenes,' and in the article 'Inquisition,' in Wetzer and Welte, has shown that the methods of the Inquisition were, in some respects, less cruel than those of the criminal courts of the day."

Schaff-Herzog Dictionary, article on "Inquisition."

"Heresy" in Spain

In Nicholas Eymerich's "Official Directory of the Inquisition" (A. D. 1567), one of the crimes classed as "heresy" is selling arms or ammunition to the French.

Adverse to the Jesuits

"The Jesuits were from first to last obnoxious to the Inquisitions of the peninsula. The hostility seen in the arrest of St. Ignatius, the persecution of St. Francis Borgia, friend of Carranza, the arrest of the Provincial, and the attempt to censure the whole Order, in 1586, the action against the Bollandists, the persecution of Vieyra, the action of the Portuguese Inquisition against the Society of Jesus, and the burning of Father Malagrida,— the hostility in all these is too clear and positive to be questioned. And, strange as it may seem, Jesuits help to swell the numbers of the sufferers for whom Llorente, and such blind followers as Rule, evoke the tears of Protestants. . . . Of canonized saints, not only St. Ignatius, St. Francis Borgia, but even St. Teresa was denounced by the Inquisition. Nor has any Grand Inquisitor or official of that later tribunal since the origin of Protestantism been beatified or canonized by the Church."

The American Catholic Quarterly Review, vol. i. p. 629.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: It did not injure Spain

"The activity of the Holy Office [of the Spanish Inquisition] was at first directed against the Jews whose obstinate adherence to their faith, in spite of persecution, was punished by an edict for their expulsion in 1492. Their departure deprived Spain of many industrious inhabitants; but its importance has been much exaggerated by authors who have failed to notice that it was followed not by the decline of Spain, but by the period of its greatest prosperity."

Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. xxii. p. 326, "Spain."

XIX

THE JESUITS

Dr. Johnson was asked on one occasion what was meant by a "Jesuit." The Doctor not inaptly replied: "Every one who is cleverer than one's self."

PROTESTANTISM swept everything before it during the first forty years of its existence. It acquired a strength and an expansion that it has never since attained. For a time France was debatable ground. An ambassador of Venice reported that nine-tenths of the German people had embraced Protestantism (A. D. 1558). Scarcely a thirtieth of the population of Austria remained Catholics. In Transylvania the people confiscated all the church property. In Poland the Protestants took possession of the parish churches and obtained a majority in the Diet; in Bohemia and Hungary Protestantism was in the ascendancy, and there

were hundreds of thousands of Belgian Calvinists. "There remain firm to the Pope," he continued, "only Spain and Italy with some few islands, and those countries possessed by your Serenity in Dalmatia and Greece."

A Catholic reaction, or "counter-reformation," ensued about the middle of the sixteenth century, and by the year 1575 the reflux wave had entered southern Germany. There was a century of conflict, ending with the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The result remains to this day: The entire debatable territory was won back by the Catholic party; France and Austria were confirmed in the old faith; Belgium, Poland, and Southern Germany were reconquered.

To a certain extent this result was due to a natural re-awakening of the Catholic faith among the people. The reconquest was certainly aided by princes like Duke Albert of Bavaria and the Emperor Ferdinand of Austria. After the polity of the times, these rulers did not scruple to use constraint. But the fact remains that the chief element of the victory was force of

conviction.[1] And the teaching and preaching that produced the result were largely that of the Jesuits.

This new order has its place in the history of Europe notably on account of its struggle with Protestantism. The original design of Loyola, its founder, was to convert the Saracens and establish headquarters at Jerusalem. But the great order drifted from the outset into its appointed work.

We observe that there was no hurry in laying the foundations of the "Society of Jesus." After he had conceived the notion, Loyola[2] spent several years attending the Spanish universities. Here he was annoyed by the Inquisition, and never after appears to have been an admirer of that tribunal; he refused, later on, to allow Jesuits to

[1] As to this matter, Macaulay says, in his essay on "Von Ranke's History of Popes": "It is moreover not to be dissembled that the triumph of the Papacy was to be chiefly attributed not to the triumph of arms but to a great reflux of public opinion."

[2] Ignatius Loyola was the youngest of thirteen children. He was born in 1491 in Spanish Biscay. His father was a nobleman. When in his thirtieth year his thoughts were turned towards a religious life by reading the Lives of the Saints, as he lay suffering from a wound received during a gallant defence of Pompeluna.

serve on it. The year 1534 found him at the University of Paris, where he lived intimately with Peter Faber and Francis Xavier. They, and a few Spanish students, were his first recruits. The group agreed to separate for a time and meet in Venice by 1537. At Venice, Ignatius worked among the poor with Father Carraffa, who afterwards became Pope. The order was formally approved at Rome in 1540. Strict obedience to the Pope, and willingness to serve the Church wherever he appointed, were elements in the Jesuit plan that strongly commended it to the Pontiff. The Catholic world needed such an order at that time.

Once approved at Rome, the new organization experienced rapid growth. This, too, notwithstanding the extended special training required of its members. But the plan of the order satisfied the best and most intelligent religious feeling of the time. At Louvain University eighteen young men, then in their master's degree, joined the Jesuits the first year of its foundation. The order at once developed some strong leaders like Francis Borgia, Duke of Gandia,

Roderigo in Portugal, Peter Canisius in Germany, and Francis Xavier. When Ignatius, who was its first general, died in 1556, there were thirteen provinces of the order. Jesuits had penetrated the forests of Brazil, and nearly a hundred followers of Xavier were at work in India and China.[1]

The personal merit of the members was one source of their popularity and influence. The education they provided was gratuitous. Unquestionably, their methods of teaching were a great advance upon those of the times. Their schools obtained that instant prestige which the world knows how to give meritorious innovations. Protestant pupils left their own universities to attend those of the Jesuits. They educated the cardinals, the bishops, and the counsellors of state, but refused to accept any of these dignities themselves.[2] Their preaching drew

[1] In 1565 there were in Europe thirty-five hundred Jesuits, and in 1580 there were over five thousand of the order in various parts of the world.

[2] Among the pupils of the Jesuits were the following: Popes Gregory XIII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII., St. Francis of Sales, Cardinal de Berulle, Bossuet, Cardinal de Fleury, Cardinal Frederico Borromeo, Flechier, Cassini, Seguier, Montesquieu, Malesherbes, Tasso Galileo, Corneille, Descartes, Molière, Jean Baptiste Rousseau, Gol-

the multitudes to their churches. Their care of the sick and interest in the poor conciliated the people. Their good manners made them desired in higher circles. They became confessors to the nobles and princes.

The "counter-reformation" in Germany was won by calling in the Jesuits. At first they were known as "Spanish priests;" but they established universities and multiplied their membership. They swarmed at every point of conflict. In one year forty thousand converts were made in Austria.[1] Bavaria was won back after a hard struggle. The Rhine provinces were next reconquered. A Jesuit was chosen King of Poland.[2] They were in every court and council directing

doni, Tournefort, Fontenelle, Muratori, Buffon, Gresset, Canova, Tilly and Wallenstein, Condé; the Emperors Maximilian and Ferdinand, many princes of Savoy, Nemours, and Bavaria, Don John of Austria.

[1] In 1626 the Emperor of Germany ordered an examination to be made as to the number of heretics converted by the Jesuits in his dominion. The number was placed at one million. (Cretineau-Joly, History of the Society of Jesus, vol. iii. p. 210.)

[2] This was John Casimir, who had entered the order in 1643. He was not yet a priest when he succeeded to the throne in 1648.

the movements of Catholic princes. Protestantism everywhere recognized its new foemen. Melanchthon, on his death-bed, in 1560, is reported to have said: "Alas! What is this? I see the whole world being filled with Jesuits." In England and Sweden severe and sanguinary treatment was visited upon them. During one year (1570) the Huguenots put forty Jesuits to death.[1] But the Jesuits were not deterred. "They dare everything," said their admirers. They entered Russia and tried to convert Turkey. Hallam, in his "Literature of Europe," notes the multitude of leading names that the Jesuits furnished in all departments of thought and investigation during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They wrote the books of Latin Europe.

Francis Xavier and his followers made a million converts in India. There were, in 1610, seven hundred and fifty thousand Japanese Catholics. Father Nobili assumed the habit of the priestly caste in India (the

[1] They were on their way to the missions in Brazil when they were captured by a Calvinistic pirate, Jacques Sourie. See Cretineau-Joly, History of the Society of Jesus.

Brahmins), and induced seventy of them to labor with him. In Paraguay the Jesuits built up an Indian nation and civilized it. In North America they established a chain of missions stretching from Quebec to New Orleans.

Yet, after the lapse of two hundred and thirty-three years, the same authority that founded the Jesuit order caused it to be suppressed. Pope Clement XIV., to "promote concord in the Church" and peace among the nations, abolished the order in 1773. The opinion of the world had changed. Spain, where the society was cradled, became its bitterest opponent, and Austria, whose fortunes the Jesuits had served in trying times, concurred in the decree. The flood-tide of enmity, which the Jesuits had been encountering for many years, then had its way.

The order was either too united, too virtuous, too astute, or too able to be an object of indifference.[1] It aroused the

[1] It is difficult to find an inclusive reason for the fact, but the fact remains nevertheless, that from the beginning the Jesuits encountered everywhere opposition and enmity. At Paris in 1565 one Jesuit writer says that

jealousy of other orders. Ambitious men envied the power it obtained in the civil governments. The "spirit of the age" in the eighteenth century was schooled against it; the Jesuits stood for the established conditions in Church and State. The whole force of social and political innovation was directed against them. The Jansenists — an able, intellectual sect — and the Encyclopædists, headed by Voltaire and D'Alembert, fought against them. Finally, three great political ministers combined to crush them, — Pombal in Portugal, D'Aranda in Spain, and Choiseul in France. The pressure of the Bourbon courts was mainly responsible for their suppression.

Through their two centuries of activity, a mass of hostile criticism and detraction was accumulated against the Jesuits. They were accused of complicity in the assas-

"on all street-corners were placards against us, and not a play was written that did not contain a satire against us." They were subject to insults in the streets. In 1595 they were expelled from Paris by the opposition of the University and Parliament. They were banished from Venice in 1605. These are but a few of a long series of attacks which they suffered in all the Catholic countries.

sination of Henry III. of France; a Jesuit (Father Garnet) was among those who paid the penalty of the Gunpowder plot; Pombal sought to implicate them in an attempt on the life of the King of Portugal; D'Aranda made Charles III. of Spain believe that they were conspiring to depose him in favor of his brother. The Dominican order accused them of heretical teachings with regard to predestination and free will, and with tolerating Pagan customs in China. Pascal, in his famous "Provincial Letters," attacked them as lax casuists. The Parliament of Paris — their inveterate foe — claimed to discover among their effects a book called the "Monita Secreta," which contained alleged rules of a nature very damaging to the order's reputation.[1]

In all these charges there was more or less circumstantial evidence, but a thorough lack of conclusive proof. The bankruptcy of a commercial house of Martinique served as a pretext for suits against the order in France which seriously crippled it.

[1] "The credit of the order was, however, far more seriously damaged by the publication at Cracow, in 1612, of an *ingenious forgery* . . . entitled *Monita Secreta*." — Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xiii. p. 650.

There were twenty-three thousand Jesuits (of whom nearly twelve thousand were priests) at the time of the suppression, in 1773. The order was re-established in 1814, and its present membership is said to be about fourteen thousand.

MACAULAY: Jesuits led the counter movement

"In the Order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit; and the history of the Order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction. That order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind, of the pulpit, of the press, of the confessional, of the academies. Wherever Jesuits preached, the church was too small for the audience. The name of Jesuit on a titlepage secured the circulation of a book. It was in the ears of the Jesuit that the powerful, the noble, and the beautiful breathed the secret history of their lives. It was at the feet of the Jesuit that the youth of the higher and middle classes were brought up from childhood to manhood, from the first rudiments to the courses

of rhetoric and philosophy. Literature and science, lately associated with infidelity or with heresy, now became the allies of orthodoxy. Dominant in the south of Europe, the great order soon went forth conquering and to conquer. In spite of oceans and deserts, of hunger and pestilence, of spies and penal laws, of dungeons and racks, of gibbets and quartering-blocks, Jesuits were to be found under every disguise and in every country; scholars, physicians, merchants, serving-men; in the hostile court of Sweden, in the old manor-house of Cheshire, among the hovels of Connaught; arguing, instructing, consoling, stealing away the hearts of the young, animating the courage of the timid, holding up the crucifix before the eyes of the dying.

". . . The old world was not wide enough for this strange activity. The Jesuit invaded all the countries which the maritime discoveries of the preceding age had laid open to European enterprise. They were to be found in the depths of the Peruvian mines, at the marts of the African slave-

caravans, on the Spice Islands, in the observatories of China. They made converts in regions which neither avarice nor curiosity had tempted any of their countrymen to enter; and preached and disputed in tongues of which no other native of the West understood a word."

Macaulay's Essays ("Review of Von Ranke's History of Popes").

RANKE: A talented order

"Such a combination of competent knowledge and indefatigable zeal, of study and persuasiveness, of pomp and asceticism, of world-wide influence and unity in the governing principle, was never beheld before or since. They were assiduous and visionary, worldly-wise and filled with enthusiasm, were competent men whose society was gladly courted, devoid of personal interest, each laboring for the advancement of the rest."

Ranke, History of Popes, book v. p. 169.

MACKINTOSH: Their intellectual record

They [the Jesuits] maintained the highest station as a religious body in the lit-

erature of Catholic countries. No other association ever sent forth so many disciples who reached such eminence in departments so various and unlike. While some of their number ruled the royal penitents at Versailles or the Escurial, others were teaching the use of the spade and the shuttle to the naked savages of Paraguay; a third body daily endangered their lives in an attempt to convert the Hindus to Christianity; a fourth carried on the controversy against the Reformers; a portion were at liberty to cultivate polite literature; while the greater part continued to be employed either in carrying on the education of Catholic Europe, or in the government of their society, and in ascertaining the ability and disposition of the junior members, so that well-qualified men might be selected for the extraordinary variety of offices in their immense commonwealth. The most famous Constitutionalists, the most skilful casuists, the ablest schoolmasters, the most celebrated professors, the best teachers of the humblest mechanical arts, the missionaries who could most bravely encounter martyrdom, or who with the most patient

skill could infuse the rudiments of religion into the minds of ignorant tribes or prejudiced nations, were the growth of their fertile schools."

Sir Jas. Mackintosh, Review of the Causes of Revolution of 1688.

FISHER: Their political ethics

"In the theory of popular sovereignty and of the social compact the peculiar tendencies of Catholic theology are most apparent. This was advocated by Lainez, the second General of the Jesuits, by the eminent Spanish Jesuit Mariana, and by Bellarmine. It is the doctrine that power, as far as temporal rule is concerned, originally resides, by the gift and appointment of God, in the people. . . . It is curious to observe the widest speculations of Locke, Rousseau, and Jefferson, as to the origin of government and the right of revolution, were anticipated by the Jesuitic scholars of the sixteenth century. It is remarkable that in opposition to these novel dogmas there appeared on the Protestant side a theory of the divine right of kings and the related doctrine of passive

obedience. . . . The advocates of freedom and revolt against spiritual authority are equally strenuous for slavish maxims of political obedience."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xiv. pp. 505–506.

LECKY: Jesuits favored democracy

"They [the Jesuits] saw, what no others of the Catholic Church seemed to have perceived, that a great future was in store for the people, and they labored, with a zeal that will secure them everlasting honor, to hasten and direct the emancipation. By a system of the boldest casuistry, by fearless use of their private judgment in all matters which the Church had not strictly defined, and by a skilful employment and expansion of some of the maxims of the school men, they succeeded in disentangling themselves from the traditions of the past, and in giving an impulse to liberalism wherever their influence extended."

Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, vol. ii. p. 147.

FISHER: Their educational system

"Their system of educational training was according to a strict method; but their

schools were pervaded by their peculiar religious spirit. It was largely through their influence that the profane or secular tone of culture that had prevailed in the cities of Italy was superseded by a culture in which reverence for religion and the Church was a vital element."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xi. p. 413.

FISHER: Jesuit scholars

"Among the members of this society, and among their pupils who were learned by it, there is included a long list of men who are distinguished for services rendered to science and learning."

Fisher, History of the Reformation, ch. xv. p. 529.

VOLTAIRE'S testimony

Voltaire, a pupil of the Jesuits, disliked them and labored hard for their suppression, yet in a letter, Feb. 7, 1746, he bears this testimony: "During the seven years that I lived in a college of the Jesuits, what have I seen there? Lives the most frugal, the hours of the day divided between their

care of us and the exercise of their austere profession. I call as witnesses the thousands of men educated as I was. Therefore it is that I am lost in astonishment at any one daring to accuse them of teaching a relaxed or corrupt morality. . . . I make no scruple in proclaiming that there is nothing more iniquitous, more shameful to humanity than to accuse of relaxed morality men who live in Europe the severest lives and who go seeking the most cruel deaths to the extremities of Asia and America."

WARD: The "Counter-Reformation"

"A well-known sentence in Macaulay's Essay on Ranke's 'History of the Popes' asserts correctly enough that in a particular epoch of history the Church of Rome, having lost a large part of Europe, not only ceased to lose but actually regained nearly half of what she had lost. Any fairly correct use of the familiar phrase 'the Counter-Reformation' must imply that this remarkable result was due to a movement pursuing two objects, originally dis-

tinct, though afterwards largely blended, viz., the regeneration of the Church of Rome and the recovery of the losses inflicted upon her by the early successes of Protestantism."

A. W. Ward, The Counter-Reformation, pp. 7, 8.

XX

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY

Assassination has never changed the history of the world. — DISRAELI, *Speech*, 1865.

THE word Huguenot (oath-bound) indicates that the French Protestants of the sixteenth century were a closely organized community. Their religious apostle was Calvin, and their preaching and actions were bold, loud, and aggressive. That the adherents of the new and the old faith should come to blows was inevitable. There were not wanting political reasons, such as the jealousies existing between the houses of Guise and Condé, to bring the quarrel to a head. The court of Navarre was Protestant; that of France was Catholic, and under the influence of the Duke of Guise.

In 1559 transpired what is known as the "Conspiracy of Amboise." It was an effort of Condé, Coligny, and other Huguenot leaders to seize the king (Francis II.) and substitute their own influence over him for the Guise influence. This attempt was checkmated, but it left both factions resting on their arms.

Three Huguenot rebellions followed, — 1562, 1567, and 1568, — in all of which they were defeated. The conduct of the Huguenots, however, tended to exasperate the great majority of the nation. They gave up the ports of Havre and Dieppe to their country's hereditary foes, the English; and they invited German guerilla bands across the frontier to pillage Normandy. A Huguenot emissary from Orleans assassinated the Duke of Guise.[1] Once again an attempt was made to kidnap the King of France at Monceau. Besides these things there were, in the popular mind, numberless instances of Huguenot excess and cruelty. Brequimaut, the leader of the re-

[1] The Guises accused Coligny of complicity in this murder. So the younger Guise was only too ready to assassinate Coligny in 1572. It was a vendetta.

formers, in 1568, wore a necklace composed of the ears of assassinated priests. Baron D'Adrets, after taking the fortress of Montbrison, compelled the Catholic prisoners to leap from the battlements into the surrounding moats, where they were caught on the upraised pikes of his soldiers. The *Michelade*, a massacre of the Catholics of Nismes, occurred in 1567; and similar acts of violence were perpetrated at Montauban, Valence, and even in Paris. Evidences of the burning of churches, plundering of monasteries, and hunting of priests were but too common.

These facts furnish some explanation — though no justification — of the frenzy and cruelty of the scenes which transpired throughout many of the towns of France during the latter days of August and part of September, 1572. Mobs rose and fell upon the Huguenot inhabitants with murderous effect. According to Ranke, twenty thousand persons perished. Lingard estimates the number as less than two thousand, and he cites the reformed martyrologist, who procured lists from the ministers in all the different towns, and

published the result in 1582, showing the names of only seven hundred and eighty-six persons. In their varying estimates of the number of victims, the majority of French historians do not go above ten thousand. It is not probable that the actual number was much over three thousand.[1]

[1] Massacres are precisely the events of history over which there is the greatest exaggeration. There have been bloody reprisals of this kind, like the Sicilian Vespers (A. D. 1282), where over thirty thousand French were massacred, that far exceeded in fatality that of St. Bartholomew. Victor Hugo says: "One man is killed in Paris — it is murder. The throats of fifty thousand people are cut in the East — it is a question." The Armenian and Bulgarian atrocities of our own time have cost more lives than many of the much advertised cruelties of religious persecution. Much, in fact, depends on who are killed rather than on how many are killed. The French "reign of terror" killed nobles with relatives whose lamentation roused Europe. Yet Carlyle says: "This convention, now grown anti-Jacobin, did, with an eye to gratify and fortify itself, publish lists of what the Reign of Terror had perpetrated, lists of persons guillotined. The lists, cries splenetic Abbé Montgaillard, were not complete. They contained the names of how many persons, thinks the reader? Two thousand, all but a few. There were above four thousand, cries Montgaillard." — Carlyle, French Revolution, "The Guillotine," book vii. ch. vi.

This bloody uprising — called the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day — was all due to the apprehensive malice of the Queen regent, Catharine de' Medici, a singular woman, Catholic in name, Atheist in belief, and accustomed to having Calvinistic sermons read to her during meals. She it was who fired the mine of religious hate which otherwise might never have exploded in so sanguinary a fashion. She feared the political aspirations of Admiral Coligny, the Huguenot leader; and by her instigation Charles IX. gave the word that Coligny should die. The threats of the Huguenot chiefs at this outrage were so loud that a dangerous uprising was apprehended. It was then resolved to exterminate Coligny's principal followers, who were at that time rendezvoused at Paris. This was done. The populace joined in the work, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew ensued.

Charles IX. put a righteous construction on his bloody deed, in reporting it to the courts of Christendom. He was quick to represent it as a stroke of self-defence whereby, on a "memorable night, by the

destruction of a few seditious men, the king had been delivered of immediate danger of death, and the realm from the perpetual terror of civil war." These were the words of the envoys, and on their strength the Pope ordered a "Te Deum" and struck a medal commemorating the preservation of Charles IX.'s precious life. Even Queen Elizabeth, the great friend of the Huguenots, was apparently satisfied by the insinuating explanation of the French ambassador.

There was no attempt made to give the massacre anything but a political color. The only bright circumstance in the deplorable occurrence was the action of the Archbishop of Lyons and the Bishops of Lisieux, Bordeaux, Toulouse, and other localities, in sheltering the fleeing Huguenots and restraining the popular violence.

Instances are cited of the occasion being utilized for private revenge and for plunder. Not a few Catholics perished as a consequence, among them a priest at Bourges, and a canon of Notre Dame at Paris. "The possession of wealth," says Mezeray, "an envied position, or the existence of

greedy relations, stamped a man as a Huguenot." [1]

When the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was first reported at Rome, the event was given the appearance of a Huguenot insurrection against the king, which had been fortunately put down. Church authorities naturally exhibited that international comity which is expected between friendly powers when one nation has escaped a political disaster. The following extract from Guizot's History of France (vol. iv. ch. xxxiii. p. 384), ascribed to a Catholic authority, makes it very clear that the Pope did not sympathize with any deed of bloodshed: "When, however, later on a detailed and faithful account of the massacre reached the Pontiff, he condemned it at once and left no doubt as to his horror at the deed. When asked by the Cardinal why he wept, Gregory answered, 'I weep

[1] Duruy says that the slaughter was continued by the dregs of the population. They killed their own creditors and enemies and those whom they wished to rob or plunder. This bloody affair did not weaken the Huguenots. By the Peace of Rochelle in 1573 that party obtained liberty of conscience. The next year Charles IX. died a miserable death.

at the means the king used, exceedingly unlawful and forbidden by God, to inflict such punishment. I fear that one will fall upon him, and that he will not live very long. I fear, too, that amongst so many dead, there died as many innocent as guilty.'"

MACAULAY: Huguenot rebellion

"For, beyond all doubt, the proceedings of the Huguenots, from the conspiracy of Amboise to the battle of Moncontour, had given much more trouble to the French monarchy than the Catholics have ever given to the English monarchy since the Reformation; and that too with much less excuse."

Macaulay's Essays, "Hallam."

BUCKLE: Huguenot intolerance

"It is on account of these things that we ought not to be surprised that during many years the French Protestants, who affected to appeal to the right of private judgment, were more intolerant of the exercise of that judgment by their adversaries than were the Catholics. Thus, while the Catholics

were theoretically more bigoted than the Protestants, the Protestants became practically more bigoted than the Catholics."

Buckle, History of Civilization, vol. ii. pp. 52–53. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1882.

BUCKLE: Forbearance of the majority

"Whatever may be the popular notion respecting the necessary intolerance of the Catholics, it is an indisputable fact that early in the seventeenth century they displayed in France a spirit of forbearance and a Christian charity to which the Protestants could make no pretence."

Buckle, History of Civilization, vol. ii. p. 65.

DURUY: As to the number of victims

"Accounts differ as to the number of the slain. Some estimate it at ten thousand, some at four thousand, and still others at two thousand. The last statement is the most probable."

Victor Duruy, History of France, p. 348. Trans. by Mrs. M. Carey. Pub., T. Y. Crowell & Co.

LINGARD: About fifteen hundred victims

"The reformed martyrologist adopted a measure of ascertaining the real number,

which may enable us to form a probable conjecture. He procured, from the ministers in the different towns where the massacres had taken place, lists of the names of the persons who had suffered or were supposed to have suffered. He published the result in 1582; and the reader will be surprised to learn that in all France he could discover the names of no more than seven hundred and eighty-six persons. Perhaps, if we double that number, we shall not be far from the real amount."

Lingard, History of England, vol. viii. note T.

RANKE'S estimate

"According to the most moderate calculation there fell two thousand persons in Paris alone, and the number massacred in France was not less than twenty thousand."

Leopold Ranke, Civil Wars and Monarchy in France, ch. xv. (last paragraph).

WHITE: The number of victims

"Probably the number of victims [in Paris] may have amounted to six thousand, but to reduce it as low as sixteen hundred for all France, which Dr. Lingard has done, is monstrously absurd. All that we know

positively is that a certain number of bodies were burned, and beyond that all is conjecture. . . . If it be necessary to choose from these haphazard estimates, that of De Thou [twenty thousand] is preferable, from the calm, unexaggerating temper of the man. But whatever be the number, not all the waters of the ocean can efface the stain upon the character of those concerned in the massacre. A few of the murderers — men of overheated fanaticism — may have truly believed they were doing God a service by putting heretics to death. For these we may feel pity even while we condemn. But the majority were impelled by the lowest of all possible motives — jealousy and ambition filled the breast of Catharine de Médicis; Anjou was envious of merits and virtue. . . . Guise dreamed but of revenge. . . . The Massacre of St. Bartholomew arose out of the paltriest and most selfish of motives. . . . The plea of religion was never put forward, though it is a plea too often employed to extenuate what cannot be justified."

Henry White, The Massacre of St. Bartholomew, pp. 459–462. New York: Harper Bros., 1868.

FLEURY: The clergy and the massacre

"The clergy, in spite of all the ill-usage they had received from the heretics, saved as many of them as they could in various places."

Fleury, tom. xxxv. ch. xxxix. p. 170.

XXI

THE EDICT OF NANTES

Then sheathes in calm repose the vengeful blade
For gentle peace, in freedom's hallowed shade.
J. Q. Adams.

THE Edict of Nantes (1598), proclaimed about a quarter of a century after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, was something more than an edict of religious toleration. It was a treaty of peace which established the political autonomy of the Huguenot party. To obtain peace, Henry IV. felt compelled to barter, to some extent, the political unity of his kingdom. The edict consisted, according to Guizot, of ninety-one open articles and fifty-two secret articles. The "secret articles" were so held in order to allay public indignation.

One of the secret articles placed fully two hundred towns of France under control of the Huguenots, and provided taxes for the garrison thereof by Huguenot sol-

diers and their fortification against the rest of France. Guizot speaks of this state of affairs as constituting a "Calvinistic republic."

The king proclaimed that his motive was "to arrange matters so that the holy name of God might be adored by all his subjects; and if it had not pleased him to enjoin that divine worship should have but one form, he wished that it should have, at least, one intention, and be so regulated that it should cause no trouble among his people."

Referring to Cardinal Richelieu's policy, which began a quarter of a century after the Edict of Nantes, M. Guizot observes that "the rebellion of the reformers, their irregular political assemblies, their alliance with foreigners, occupied him [the cardinal] far more than their ministers' teachings. . . . It was a state within a state that the reformers were seeking to found and the cardinal wished to upset." Guizot was himself a French Protestant.

The Huguenot inhabitants of Rochelle, in 1627, very deliberately invited the assistance of England as against their own

king, and the fleet of the Duke of Buckingham was welcomed by them with acclaim. As to their prohibition of Catholic worship, Buckle, in his "History of Civilization," says: "The Protestants soon learned to despise that great Edict of Nantes, by which their liberties were secured, and proceeded to rob and murder that very party to whom they owed a toleration which had been reluctantly conceded by the prejudices of the age. They were not content to exercise their own religion unless they could also trouble the religion of others. At La Rochelle, which for importance was the second city in the kingdom, they would not permit the Catholics to have a single church in which to celebrate what for centuries had been the sole religion in France, and was still the religion of an enormous majority of Frenchmen."

Nearly a hundred years later (1685) the Edict of Nantes was revoked by Louis XIV. So far as the revocation did away with the condition of affairs whereby the kingdom was weakened and divided in its political jurisdiction, it was undoubtedly

wise and politic. All the best men in France praised it. So far as it interfered, as it did, with the religious liberty of the Protestants, it was entirely indefensible. Pope Innocent XI., who was then Pope, disapproved of the revocation (Gaillardin, History of the Reign of Louis XIV., vol. v. p. 111).

It may be observed, in explanation of this act of persecution, that France, a Catholic country, was at that time alone in Europe in tolerating a dissenting faith. In Holland and Sweden Catholicity was prohibited. In Ireland Catholic priests were hunted like wolves, and Catholics were forbidden, by law, to have schools or schoolmasters. But to every fair-minded person in our age, the Revocation, especially in the rigors visited upon the oppressed Huguenots who rose in rebellion, seems an utterly cold-blooded and repellent proceeding throughout.

Madame de Maintenon is sometimes unjustly accused of prompting Louis XIV. to this measure, but Voltaire declared: "She had nothing to do with it; that is a certain fact."

Points of gross exaggeration occur in esti-

mating the number of Huguenots who fled from France on account of Louis XIV.'s revocation. Some follow Hume in placing the figures at about five hundred thousand. The Duke of Burgundy, a pupil of Fénelon and a contemporary, places the number at sixty-eight thousand, and Benoit, a Protestant authority, makes it two hundred thousand.[1]

Without any new tax, the revenues of France were increased in the years following the Huguenot exodus, and there was no marked commercial or industrial depression, such as the pride of the Huguenots would fain have the world believe. Any one of Louis XIV.'s many wars was more costly to France than the Huguenot exodus.

Victor Duruy, the French historian, tells us that before the revocation there were a million Protestants in France (Modern History, ch. xxi.). To-day there are about

1 "The only historian who professes to have pursued the inquiry in exact detail is Capefigue, and from his minute scrutiny of the cartons des généralités, as prepared in the closing years of the seventeenth century, he obtains a computation of two hundred and twenty-five thousand or two hundred and thirty thousand." — R. L. Poole, Hist. of the Huguenots of the Dispersion, ch. iii.

seven hundred thousand French Protestants. This act of persecution failed in the purpose of extirpating Protestantism in France.

ADAMS: What the Revocation was

"In October, 1685, the Edict of Nantes was formally revoked. The Huguenots were deprived of the privilege of public worship and of their civil rights. The new edict did not deprive them of their religion. They were allowed to remain Protestants, but they lost all legal rights and were exposed to constant danger in person and property."

Growth of the French Nation, pp. 227–228, by George B. Adams, Professor of History in Yale University.

DURUY: How the Revocation was received

"This disastrous and criminal measure was hailed with gratitude by a great part of the nation."

History of France, p. 443.

GUIZOT: The Huguenot exodus

"Vauban, however, remained very far from the truth when he deplored in 1688

'the desertion of one hundred thousand men, the withdrawal from the kingdom of sixty millions of livres, the enemy's fleet swelled by nine thousand sailors the best in the kingdom, the enemy's armies by six hundred officers and twelve thousand soldiers who had seen service.'"

Guizot, Outlines of French History, p. 412.

MARTIN: The number who left France

"The amount from two hundred thousand to two hundred and fifty thousand from the Revocation to the commencement of the following century [1700] seems most probable."

Martin, History of France, part vii. p. 53.

XXII

THE PERSECUTION OF THE IRISH

They bribed the flock, they bribed the son,
To sell the priest and rob the sire;
Their dogs were taught alike to run
Upon the scent of wolf and friar.

. . . . .

Forbid to plead,
Forbid to read,
Disarmed, disfranchised, imbecile —
What wonder if our step betrays
The freedman born in penal days?

THOMAS DAVIS.

RELIGIOUS persecution in Ireland lasted longer and was of a more sanguinary and bitter character than any of the persecutions of history, the persecutions of the early Christians alone excepted.

Prior to the Reformation there had been an English occupancy and settlement of a portion of Ireland, characterized by much intermittent border and feudal warfare. But the "iron age" for Ireland began with the reign of Elizabeth, and it lasted nearly

three hundred years. From 1560 religious animosity motived and inspired England's oppression of Ireland.

In other instances of religious persecution, the oppressors were of the same nationality as those whose consciences they violated, and this circumstance humanized (if the word may be used) and limited the duration of the persecution. But in the case of Ireland the persecuting force came from a foreign nationality; and national prejudice intensified and sustained the religious animosity of the persecution.

There were superadded to this persecuting spirit, thus intensified by national prejudice, certain other attributes which further increased its hatefulness. In Austria and France Catholics persecuted Protestants for the purpose of converting them. In Sweden Catholics were persecuted with the same mistaken zeal. But in Ireland the persecution of the Catholics was undertaken during the Elizabethan period, with the ulterior purpose of robbing them of their lands;[1] during the succeeding reigns this

[1] Dr. Richey, in his "Short History of Ireland," says of the causes of Irish rebellion under Elizabeth: "But the

religious tyranny was kept up with the more or less plainly expressed purpose of exterminating the Irish inhabitants, as a people unregenerate and intractable;[1] and when it was seen that massacre and banishment would not exterminate them, the persecution was continued under a penal code, which sought to debase them socially and degrade them intellectually, — not that they

hatred and suspicion of all that was Irish, the desire to utilize the country for the benefit of the English, and the greed for grants of lands and forfeited estates in this as in many other occasions, influenced the conduct of the government, the miserable results of which form the staple of our subsequent history."

"They [the English Government] believed that the one effectual policy for making Ireland useful to England was, in the words of Sir John Davis, "to root out the Irish" from the soil, to confiscate the property of the septs, and plant the country systematically with English tenants. . . . Many Irish proprietors were executed on the most frivolous pretexts, and these methods of obtaining confiscations were so systematically and skilfully resorted to, that it soon became evident to chiefs and people that it was the settled policy of the English government to deprive them of their land." — Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. ch. i. p. 14.

[1] Joyce, in his "History of Ireland," ch. xv., says: "I fear that we must admit that during the reign of Elizabeth assassination was not merely a thing of occasional occurrence, but a recognized mode of dealing with Irish chiefs."

might be converted, but that "Protestant ascendancy" (a phrase of the times) might be maintained and perpetuated.

There are incidents in the fearful persecution to which the Irish were subjected for nearly three centuries, that parallel every lurid crime in the history of persecution, whether political or religious. At the very outset (in the first years of Elizabeth's reign) there was, for instance, the massacre of Mullaghmast[1] — beside which the massacre of Glencoe sinks into insignificance. The devastation with fire and sword of South Ireland, after the suppression of the Geraldine revolt, outrivals, in atrocity, anything in the Thirty Years' War.[2] The mas-

[1] "The massacre of Mullaghmast, as it was called, stands out in the Irish annals as a most atrocious deed of blood. If the story be even partly true, Glencoe was a trifle compared to it." — Cambridge Historical Series: Ireland, ch. iv., by Wm. O'Connor Morris.

[2] "Great tracts were deserts of a more hideous aspect than the battlefields of a Thirty Years' war." — Morris, Ireland, ch. iv. p. 115.

Edmund Spenser thus describes what he saw in Munster after the suppression of the Geraldine revolt: "Out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legges could not bare them, they looked like anatomies of death, they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they

sacres and forays of English expeditions, which provoked and signalized the first years of the insurrection of 1641, destroyed more people than the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. Cromwell's ruthless treatment of the vanquished people of Drogheda and Wexford is a bloodier page than the sack of Magdeburg.[1] The twelve

did eate the dead carrions, happy where they could finde them, yea and one another soone after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves: and if they found a plot of watercresses or shamrocks there they flocked as to a feast for the time: that in short space of time there were none (that is people) almost left, and a most populous and plentifull country suddainely left void of man and beast."

"More men, women, and children were killed by starvation in pursuance of the orders of the Lord President [in Elizabeth's reign] where there was no longer an Irish soldier in arms, than perished in the three French revolutions by the crimes of the Jacobins, the Reds, and the Communists. The persecution of English Protestants by Mary had been merciless, but Elizabeth murdered more Irish Catholics in a week in Munster than Mary murdered English Protestants in her entire reign." — A Bird's Eye View of Irish History, by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, K. C. M. G., p. 61.

[1] "He besieged Drogheda, which was held for the king, and put to the sword the entire garrison, and the population of all ages and both sexes, nobody being spared. The massacre continued for several days; it is admitted that between three and four thousand persons were butchered in cold blood; and a score or two of the

years of warfare between 1641 and 1653 had been characterized in Ireland by few pitched battles, — that of Benburb, where not to exceed four thousand men fell, being the most conspicuous. The armies in the field did not aggregate over forty thousand men on either side. Yet such had been the butchery and devastation committed by the victors, that one-third of the people (according to English authority) were killed off.[1]

inhabitants who alone escaped were sent as slaves to the tobacco plantations." — Duffy, A Bird's Eye View of Irish History, p. 115.

"The sieges of Drogheda and Wexford, however, and the massacres that accompanied them, deserve to rank in horror with the most atrocious exploits of Tilly or Wallenstein, and they made the name of Cromwell eternally hated in Ireland." — Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. ch. i. p. 101.

1 "The war ended at last in 1652. According to the calculation of Sir W. Petty, out of a population of 1,466,000, 616,000 had in eleven years perished by the sword, by plague, or by famine artificially produced. 504,000, according to this estimate, were Irish, 112,000 of English extraction." — Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. ch. i. p. 104.

"One of the Puritan soldiers [Colonel Lawrence] has left us a picture of Ireland under the rule of the saints, which bears small resemblance, it must be confessed, to the New Jerusalem. 'The plague and famine had so swept away the whole counties, that a man might travel twenty or thirty miles, and not see a living creature, either man, beast, or bird, they being all dead, or had quitted

The Irish exodus, after Cromwell laid his mailed hand on the country, exceeded all the Huguenot exodus after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Thirty-four thousand Irish soldiers alone left their country, between 1650 and 1655, to enter the service of Catholic countries.

A new cruelty, happily not imitated by any other persecuting power, followed Cromwell's conquest. A thousand Irish boys were sold as slaves to the Barbadoes, and a thousand Irish girls under fifteen were sent, as slaves, to Jamaica.[1] Sir William Petty says that over six thousand Irish were thus herded together and sold into slavery.[2]

these desolate places. Our soldiers would tell stories of the places where they saw smoke, it was so rare to see smoke by day, or fire or candle by night." — Duffy, A Bird's Eye View of Irish History, p. 123.

[1] "By the direct agency of Cromwell's son a rape like Herod's was committed on the children of the poorer classes, of whom he caused one thousand boys to be sold as slaves and one thousand innocent Irish girls to be sent to Jamaica, to a fate which would scarcely be adequately avenged if the authentic ruler spent an eternity in the region to which Cavalier toasts assigned him. The admitted aim of the Lord Protector was to extirpate the Irish race, and his policy is still known among them as the 'Curse of Cromwell.'" — Duffy, A Bird's Eye View of Irish History, p. 120.

[2] "Some contemporary accounts made the whole

The spoliation of the persecuted people proceeded at the same time. Under Elizabeth and James I., a fourth of the island was taken from the Catholics and vested in English adventurers and land-grabbers. Cromwell's spoliation was more wholesale; he appointed a day when all the native and Catholic population were required to take themselves off to the province of Connaught, under penalty of death, leaving the other provinces of Ireland to be given to English Protestants. The penalty for any Catholic who was found east of the Shannon after a day named was death. "To hell or Connaught," was Cromwell's command to the conquered people.

The era of the Penal Code, which lasted for more than two generations during the eighteenth century, was virtually an effort on the part of the persecuting power to debase and degrade, intellectually and socially, a people whom they could not exterminate. Four-fifths of the Irish continued to be Catholics. The Protestant, or "Ascendancy," party constituted an English

number of children and adults so transplanted one hundred thousand." — McGee, History of Ireland, vol. ii. p. 55.

garrison in Ireland, oppressing the people by the whole power of England, which stood back of it. Catholics could hold no offices; could not become lawyers, doctors, nor teachers; could not purchase land; could not own a horse valued at more than five pounds; they could not have schools of their own, nor send their children abroad to be educated.[1] In fact, they had no legal status in a land where they were four-fifths of the population. It was laid down from the bench of justice that the mere existence of the "Papist" in Ireland was not to be presumed. The law sought to corrupt their social fealty by permitting a son who became a Protestant to dispossess his father,

[1] "One statute prohibited a Papist from instructing another Papist; another prohibited a Protestant from instructing a Papist; a third provided that no Papist should be sent out of Ireland to receive instruction. If these three laws had duly been capped by a fourth ordering for execution every Papist who neglected to provide a first-class education for his children, the whole edifice would have been beautifully complete and symmetrical." — Lectures by Professor J. W. Barlow, M. A., Professor of Modern History in Trinity College, Dublin.

The Irish, however, in many cases educated their children by stealth in hedge schools:

"Beside the lonely rath, beneath the mountain fern,
The schoolmaster and scholars met *feloniously to learn.*"

and an unfaithful wife to obtain a jointure by giving up her religion. The purpose of this code was to enforce illiteracy among four-fifths of the nation; to deprive them of the name of religion; to reduce them to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water; to take out of their lives all ambition for industrial betterment and all faith in human justice; to make them savages, outlaws, and pariahs. And this code prevailed and was enforced beyond the middle of the eighteenth century; and its last vestiges were not swept away even in the memory of living men.

LELAND: A policy of extermination

"The favorite object of Irish governors and the English Parliament was the utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland. Their estates were already marked out and allotted to their conquerors, so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin."

Leland, Hist. of Ireland, vol. iii. p. 192.

CARTE: Puritan hatred of the Irish

"It was confidently averred that Sir John Clotworthy, who well knew the designs of the faction that governed in the House of Commons of England, had declared there in a speech, 'that the conversion of the Papists in Ireland was only to be effected by the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other;' and Mr. Pym gave out that he would not leave a priest in Ireland. To the like effect Sir William Parsons, out of a strange weakness or a detestable policy, positively asserted, before many witnesses at a public entertainment in Dublin, that within a twelvemonth no Catholic should be seen in Ireland."

Carte, Life of Ormonde, vol. i. p. 235.

LECKY: The alleged massacre of 1641

"It has been asserted by numerous writers, and is still frequently believed, that the Ulster rebellion began with a general and indiscriminate massacre of the Protestants, who were living without suspicion among the Catholics, resembling the massacre of the Danes by the English, the massacre

of the French in the Sicilian Vespers, or the massacre of the Huguenots at St. Bartholomew. . . . As is almost always the case in a great popular rising, there were, in the first outbreak of the Rebellion, some murders, but they were few; and there was at this time nothing whatever of the nature of a massacre."

Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. ch i. pp. 46–47.

MORRIS: Ireland under Cromwell

"Ireland lay prostrate at the feet of Cromwell; the doom of the great Puritan was sternly enforced. Some of the leaders of the Rebellion of 1641 had perished; some remained to fall into the hands of the hangman. The religion of the great body of the Irish people was proscribed, as idolatry to be purged out of the land; the celebration of the Mass was made a crime; not a few priests who tried to live among their flocks and to do their sacred office in secret, were carried off to the West Indies and sold as slaves. This was the fate, too, of many of the Irishry who had appeared in arms; merchants from Bristol contracted for the

odious traffic of shipping them to Barbadoes for the planters; hundreds were doubtless thrown to the sharks on the voyage; but the descendants of the exiles are still known as what are called 'the low whites' of the island."

Ireland, by Wm. O'Connor Morris, County Court, Judge of the United Counties of Roscommon and Sligo (in the Cambridge Historical Series, edited by G. W. Prothero), p. 153.

BURKE: The meaning of "Protestant ascendancy"

"Protestant ascendancy is neither more nor less than the resolution of one set of people in Ireland to consider themselves as the sole citizens in the commonwealth, and to keep a dominion over the rest by reducing them to absolute slavery under a military power."

Burke's Works, vol. v. p. 239.

MORRIS: Threefold object of the Penal Code

"It was the first object, however, of the Penal Code and of its authors, the ruling Protestant caste, to divorce the Catholics

as completely as possible from the land, the source of wealth and political power, and to deprive them even of the remnant they still retained, after the wrongs they had endured for ages. The second great object of the Penal Code was to shut out the Irish Catholic from any place of trust in the state, nay, from the pale of civilized life. He had been forbidden, we have seen, to have a seat in his country's Parliament; he was erelong deprived of the elective suffrage; he was excluded 'from the corporations, from the magistracy, from the Bar, from the Bench, from the County Grand Juries, even from the Parish vestries;' he could not 'be a Sheriff, a solicitor, a gamekeeper, a constable.' The proscription went even lower down; the Irish Catholic could not serve in the Army or on the Fleet; he could not possess any arms or weapons; he was, in a word, 'only recognized by law for repression and punishment,' and disentitled to nearly all the rights of a freeman. And while this people of Pariahs, who, be it observed, formed the overwhelming majority of the community as a whole, 'was excluded in its own

country, from almost every profession and from every government office, from the highest to the lowest,' the Code went out of its way, so to speak, to humiliate the whole body of the Irish Catholics, to degrade them, in a word, to the position of outcasts. It is unnecessary to point out how the laws as to the land could make the life of a Catholic owner wretched; a rebellious son, an adulterous wife could defy his authority and simply rob him; and it should be added that even in his dying hour he could not commit his children to the care of a guardian of his own faith, he was compelled to devolve this trust to a Protestant. . . . The last great object of the Penal Code was to destroy the organization of the Church of the Irish Catholics and to make their religion a byword and a reproach. Catholic Archbishops, bishops, deans, and vicars-general were doomed to exile; if they returned to Ireland they were guilty of high-treason and liable to the frightful penalties annexed to the crime. The same law was applied to the regular clergy. Monks, friars, and even nuns could not remain in Ireland; if

they did they carried their lives in their hands."

Ireland, by Wm. O'Connor Morris, County Court, Judge of the United Counties of Roscommon and Sligo (in the Cambridge Historical Series, edited by G. W. Prothero), pp. 203–205.

LECKY: The Penal Code

"It was directed not against the few, but against the many. It was not the persecution of a sect, but the degradation of a nation. It was the instrument employed by a conquering race, supported by a neighboring Power, to crush to the dust the people among whom they were planted. And, indeed, when we remember that the greater part of it was in force for nearly a century, that its victims formed at least three-fourths of the nation, that its degrading and dividing influence extended to every field of social, political, professional, intellectual, and even domestic life, and that it was enacted without the provocation of any rebellion, in defiance of a treaty which distinctly guaranteed the Irish Catholics from any further oppression on account of their religion, it may be justly regarded as one

of the blackest pages in the history of persecution."

Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. ch. ii. pp. 169, 170.

BURKE: A diabolical machine

Edmund Burke says that "the Penal Code was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of men."

Burke's Works, vol. iii. p. 495.

DR. JOHNSON: Irish persecutions unparalleled

"The Irish," said Dr. Johnson, "are in a most unnatural state, for we there see the minority prevailing over the majority. There is no instance, even in the Ten Persecutions, of such severity as that which the Protestants of Ireland have exercised against the Catholics."

Boswell's Life of Johnson, ch. xxix.

XXIII

GALILEO

Every great scientific truth goes through three stages: first, people say it conflicts with the Bible; next, they say it has been discovered before; lastly, they say they always believed it. — AGASSIZ.

NEARLY two centuries before Galileo, the probability of the earth's motion around the sun was broached by Cardinal Cusa.[1] But the learned world merely tolerated the supposition, and held firmly to the Ptolemaic or geocentric theory. About the middle of the sixteenth century Copernicus, a Polish priest, published his great work on the revolution of the heavenly bodies, and the theory was then called the Copernican theory. The learned world was still uncon-

[1] The Copernican theory was foreshadowed centuries before Copernicus. An Irish scholar, Virgilius, Bishop of Salzburg, had in the eighth century taught the existence of antipodes.

vinced; the theory was looked upon as a clever piece of guesswork.

In 1596 Kepler, "the founder of modern astronomy," then teaching at the University of Tuebingen, offended the Lutheran theological faculty by advocating the truth of Copernicanism. These Lutheran inquisitors condemned the theory of the earth's motion as heretical; and Kepler had to quit their university and find refuge in a Jesuit college.

Galileo had his first brush with the churchly scientists in 1615. He thought he found the Copernican theory to be something more than a mere probability, and he proceeded to advocate it as an established truth. Especially did he concern himself with explaining away the eternal Biblical nut of his opponents, — Joshua's order compelling the sun to stand still. This brought him into the full stream of exegetical discussion, and certain churchmen denounced his writings before the Roman Inquisition. We can only remark of the Roman Inquisition that it was a fallible tribunal, and no wiser than its day. Secchi, the astronomer, tells us that "none of the real proofs of the

earth's rotation upon its axis were known at the time of Galileo." Not until Réaumur had ascertained the velocity of light, and Newton the laws of gravitation, was the scientific truth of the system established. Bacon in England, Descartes in France, Tycho Brahe in Germany, and all the universities of Europe were contemporaneously sceptical of, and prejudiced against, Copernicanism, equally with the conscientious Biblical scholars who made up the Roman Inquisition. The Inquisition found that the earth's moving about the sun was an idea at variance with Holy Writ, and they placed the book of Copernicus on the Index. Galileo was admonished to let the subject rest; and he agreed to do so.

Subsequently, in 1633, the matter again came before the Inquisition because of a book written by Galileo, in which, contrary to the command of the Inquisition, he had again argued in favor of Copernicanism. With the exception of being threatened with torture unless he told the truth as to his intentions in publishing his book, Galileo was well treated during this second trial. The Inquisitors, with such wisdom as was

current in their day, again bolstered up the old Ptolemaic system as the only theory which would accord with Joshua's command to the sun, and condemned Galileo's teaching as a false opinion, opposed to Scripture.[1]

Galileo was at the time well liked at Rome, the reigning Pope being a personal friend of his. A month after his trial he was peacefully living at home, pursuing his scientific studies and occasionally visiting his daughters at a convent in which they were cloistered nuns. Practically the only penalty imposed upon him was a periodic recitation of the seven Penitential Psalms.[2] He received a pension from the Papal gov-

[1] There is no mention of papal approval in the original manuscript of Galileo's trial, published by Henri L'Epinois; and Von Gebler, who thoroughly studied the question, says distinctly there was no such approval or confirmation. (Von Gebler, Galileo Galilei, translated by Mrs. Joseph Sturge, p. 236.)

[2] The actual sentence pronounced upon him by the Inquisition is expressed in these words: "We condemn you to the formal prison of the Holy Office, for a period determinable at our pleasure; and by way of salutary penance we order you during the next three years to recite once a week the seven penitential psalms, reserving to ourselves the power of moderating, commuting, or taking off the whole or part of the said punishment and penance."

ernment, and died (1642), as he had lived, a very religious man.

Allegations that Galileo was tortured by the Inquisition, or cast into a dungeon, or sentenced to imprisonment, are without foundation; and the decrees of the Roman Inquisition, while they illustrate the fallibility of churchmen, are strenuously objected to by Catholics as in no manner constituting the action of the Church, since they were neither the decrees of a general council nor the *ex cathedra* promulgations of the Pope.[1]

WHEWELL: Statement of the case

"The ecclesiastical authorities were naturally adverse to express themselves in favor of a novel opinion, startling to the common mind, and contrary to the most obvious

[1] Muratori, who wrote many years before the works of Galileo were removed from the Index, says that the Copernican system was condemned, "not by an edict of the Supreme Pontiff, but by the Congregation of the Holy Office. . . . To-day this system is everywhere in vogue, and Catholics are not forbidden to hold it." Tiraboschi admires the "Providence of God in favor of His Church; since at a time when the majority of theologians firmly believed that the Copernican system was contrary to the Sacred Scripture, the Church was not permitted to give a solemn decision on the matter."

meaning of the words of the Bible. And when they were compelled to pronounce they decided against Galileo and his doctrines. He was accused before the Inquisition in 1615, but at that period the result was that he was merely recommended to confine himself to the mathematical reasonings upon the system and to abstain from meddling with the Scripture. . . . But in 1632 he published his *Dialogo, etc.* . . . The result was that Galileo was condemned for his infraction of the injunction laid upon him in 1615. . . . This celebrated event must be looked upon rather as a question of decorum than a struggle in which the interests of truth and free inquiry were deeply concerned. The general acceptance of the Copernican theory was no longer a matter of doubt. Several persons in the highest authority, including the Pope himself, looked upon the doctrine with favorable eyes, and had shown their interest in Galileo's discoveries. They had tried to prevent his involving himself in trouble by discussing the question on Scriptural grounds. . . . Throughout the course of the proceedings against him, Galileo was treated with great

courtesy and indulgence. He was condemned to a formal imprisonment and a very light discipline. . . . It has sometimes been asserted or insinuated that Galileo was subjected to bodily torture, ... but M. Biot more justly remarks (Biogr. Universelle, art. 'Galileo') that such a procedure is incredible. To the opinion of M. Biot we may add that of Delambre, who rejects the notion of Galileo having been put to torture."

History of Inductive Sciences, vol. i. pp. 282–284, by Wm. Whewell, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1869.

Contemporary opinion

On Jan. 10, 1634, Descartes writes to Father Marsenne: "Of course, you are well aware that Galileo has been up before the Inquisition, and his opinion about the earth's motion has been condemned as heretical. But as I have not yet heard that this censure has been authorized by the Pope (that is, officially), but merely by a congregation of cardinals, I have not yet abandoned all hope." Gassendi says: "For myself, I reverence the decree whereby

certain cardinals are said to have approved of the earth's stationariness. For though the Copernicans maintain that these texts of Scripture are not to be taken literally — nevertheless, since these texts are explained differently by men whose authority (as is manifest) is so great in the Church, for that reason I stand on their side, and do not blush on this occasion to hold my intellect captive. Not that on that account *I deem it an article of faith;* for — so far as I know — that is not asserted by [these cardinals] themselves, nor *is it promulgated and received throughout the Church.*" In 1651 Father Riccioli, S. J., writes: "It is not as yet of faith that the sun moves and the earth remains stationary by reason of the Congregational decrees, inasmuch as neither the Pope, nor any council approved by him, has issued a definition upon this point."

Nature of the Index

"The Church gives her decisions of doctrine, not through the declarations of any such tribunals as the Holy Office or the Congregation of the Index. These are only subordinate working offices or bureaus for

the expediting of business. They are not clothed with her supreme authority. When she defines doctrines it is through her General Councils and through the voice of her Supreme Pontiff, speaking *ex cathedra*."

American Cath. Quar. Review, vol. vii. p. 104.

The decree revoked (A.D. 1752)

"Galileo, on Feb. 26, 1616, properly closed his case then before the Holy Office. Another congregation, that of the Index, had taken up the matter, and on March 5th published a general disciplinary rule and enactment prohibiting henceforth books that upheld the Copernican theory as absolute truth, that theory being erroneous and contrary to the Holy Scripture, and also requiring that such books already published should be so amended as to present the theory in an hypothetical form, or mere theory, not as an established positive truth. . . . The Congregation of the Index acted as it had been declared it would act. In 1752 the decree of 1616, against teaching Copernicanism as an absolute truth, was revoked."

American Cath. Quar. Review, vol. vii. p. 94.

"Let alone" the better policy

"Still, we may regret that the Congregation of the Index did not accept the wise counsels of Cardinal Barberini, and of others agreeing with him, and abstain altogether from enacting the decree."

American Cath. Quar. Review, vol. vii. p. 113.

SCHAFF-HERZOG: Unfounded statements

"The published documents of the trial do not sustain the charge that he [Galileo] was tortured. He made public recantations the next day. The famous legend that, on rising from his knees after his recantation, he exclaimed, '*E pur si muove*' (And yet it does move), seems to have no adequate foundation."

Schaff-Herzog Dictionary, article on "Inquisition." Philip Schaff, D.D., Editor, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. The Christian Literature Co., Publishers, N. Y., 1888.

BRITISH ENCYCLOPÆDIA: "It still moves"

"The legend according to which Galileo, rising from his knees, after repeating the formula of abjuration, stamped on the ground

and exclaimed 'E pur si muove,' is, as may be readily supposed, entirely apocryphal. The earliest ascertained authority for it is the seventh edition of an Historical Dictionary published at Caen in 1789."

Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. x. p. 34.

XXIV

THE GUNPOWDER PLOT

Vengeance has no foresight. — NAPOLEON.

THREE lurid episodes in the history of religious persecution in England are the Gunpowder Plot (1605), the "revelations" of Titus Oates (1678–82), and the Lord Gordon riots (1780). Each has its own significance, — the Gunpowder Plot illustrating to what desperate straits persecution may drive bold men; the Oates revelations discovering the almost incredible gullibility of a bigoted nation and its ruthless readiness to revenge its blind fears upon the weak minority; and the Lord Gordon riots forming an instance of a frequent tendency in English Protestantism to assert itself in mob uprisings.

There were scarcely a dozen English Catholics in the secret of the Gunpowder

Plot (1605). It was a most desperately formed plan to blow the king, lords, and commons of England into eternity, to seize the heir to the throne, and to proclaim a Catholic protectorate. It is not probable that, in any event, the plot could have gone further than the explosion of the thirty-six barrels of gunpowder that Guy Fawkes was prepared to fire in the vault under the Parliament building. A Catholic peer, Lord Mounteagle, whom the conspirators wished to save from the wreck, was warned not to attend Parliament on the day appointed; upon which information he took steps to frustrate the conspiracy. But the fact that a rational Catholic thus prevented this murderous plot of a dozen of his frenzied co-religionists did not save the whole English Catholic community. They all felt the heavy hand of Protestant resentment. If they had ground for complaint before the 5th of November, 1605, they were given double ground for mourning after that date.

They had expected better things of James I. when he came to the English throne in 1603; his mother (Mary Queen of Scots)

had been a Catholic, and Catholics had bled in her defence. James might at least suspend the harsh laws against the poor Papists. But he did not. All the fines for not attending Protestant worship were freshly enforced against them; twenty pounds a month, and a forfeiture of two-thirds of their goods, if the fine remained unpaid, was the penalty, and a horde of Scotch court followers were enriched by it. The Catholics of England were pauperized. Every man connected with the Gunpowder Plot — especially Robert Catesby, the real instigator of it — had suffered personally for his religion. Disappointment, despair, and resentment were the feelings that possessed them. Henry IV. of France advised James that while these men must be punished, he should recognize the evil of persecution in driving men to such deeds, and goad the Catholics no further. This wisdom was too advanced for the English Parliament of that day. It enacted additional penal laws, debarring Catholics from the practice of law or surgery, from residing in London, and from acting as executors. Catholic parents were fined a hundred

pounds for every child they failed to have baptized as a Protestant, and the king was empowered to seize, if he desired, two-thirds of the goods of Catholics failing to attend Protestant worship. James exercised this power by granting to his favorites the right of "making profit" out of certain specified nobles.[1] The Earl of Northumberland was fined £300,000.

One feature of the Gunpowder Plot was the attempt to connect the Jesuits with it. The Jesuit provincial, Father Garnet, was executed because it appeared that he had some knowledge of the existence of the conspiracy, indirectly obtained under seal of the confessional. It was claimed for him that he had done all in his power to dissuade the desperate men from their purpose. The offence charged against him was his being privy to the plot and not revealing it; he contending that the secrecy of the confessional obliged him to refrain from turning informer.[2]

[1] The very words used in one of the state papers of the time are these: "A list of such recusants as his Majesty hath granted liberty to his servants to make profit of."

[2] An English Catholic priest, Father Gerard, is the author of a book published a few years ago and entitled

The charge has been made, and there are some grounds for the theory, that the Gunpowder Plot was concocted by James I.'s prime minister, Robert Cecil, with a view to solidifying his power. Lord Cobham, for instance, tells us that King James was in the habit of speaking of the 5th of November "as Cecil's birthday." (Advocate of Conscience Liberty, p. 225, A. D. 1665.)

Carte the historian (History of England, vol. iii. p. 757, London, 1747) thinks it not improbable that Cecil knew all about the plot. A contemporary Protestant bishop of Gloucester says of Cecil: "The great statesman had intelligence of all this, and because he would show his service to the State, he would first contrive and then discover a treason, and the more odious and hateful the treason were, his service would be the greater and more acceptable." Bishop Usher is quoted as holding a like view.

"What was the Gunpowder Plot?" in which he argues "that the true history of the Gunpowder Plot is now known to no man; that the history commonly received is certainly untrue." Father Gerard inclines to the opinion that the plot was encouraged by Cecil.

GARDINER: Where the blame rests

"The blame of the gunpowder plot does not lie with 'the Papists.' It lies, at the most, on a small body of conspirators, and even in their case the government must bear a share of it, not because it invented or encouraged the plot, but because by reinforcement of the penal laws it irritated ardent and excited natures beyond endurance."

Gardiner: What was the Gunpowder Plot? p. 8. Longmans, Green, & Co., London, 1897.

GARDINER: Jesuits did not originate the plot

"The government theory that Garnet and the other Jesuits had organized the plot was undoubtedly false. That there was a plot at all is undoubtedly owing to James's conduct in receding from his promises."

Gardiner: What was the Gunpowder Plot? pp. 199, 200. Longmans, Green, & Co., London, 1897.

GREEN: Father Garnet's position

"Though he [Garnet] had shrunk from all part in the plot, its existence had been made known to him by another Jesuit,

Greenway, and horror-stricken, as he had represented himself to have been, he had kept the secret and left Parliament to its doom."

Green, Hist. of the English People, book vii. ch. iii.

XXV

THE "POPISH PLOT"

The rabble gather round the man of news and listen with their mouths open; some tell, some hear, some judge of news, some make it, and he that lies most loud is most believed.

DRYDEN.

Of all things wisdom is the most terrified with epidemical fanaticism, because of all enemies it is that against which she is the least able to furnish any kind of resource. — BURKE.

THE influence of the Gunpowder Plot affected the imagination of succeeding generations of Englishmen. Jesuits and "plotting Papists" were credited with every dire and damaging occurrence. The air of England for two centuries was surcharged with prejudice against them. When two-thirds of London was burned, in 1666, the catastrophe was placed at the door of the Catholics, and the pillar erected to commemorate the great

fire bore that groundless charge against them for nearly two hundred years.[1] (It was finally erased in 1830 by order of the London aldermen.)

The stories, perpetrated by Titus Oates in 1678 against the Catholics, pandered to this deep-rooted, gullible, and insensate prejudice. Oates was an adventurer of bad character; his success and the gratitude he evoked by "his providential disclosures" induced other adventurers to follow his example. One of these was a convict named Bedloe; another was a young man named Dangerfield, who had been convicted of numerous crimes; there were a dozen in all, some of them imported from Ireland, to prove the existence of a Popish plot there.

All united in alleging that there was a Catholic conspiracy to murder the king, massacre the Protestants, and bring in a French army of subjugation. There were numerous variances, contradictions, and

[1] Pope makes reference to this circumstance in these lines:

"Where London's column pointing to the skies
Like a tall bully, lifts its head and lies."

inconsistencies in the testimony of these men; but their explanations that they "were sick," or "did not recollect clearly," or "were mistaken in the details," were accepted by the gullible public. The killing of Godfrey, a magistrate before whom Oates had made his deposition, was the circumstance which first gave credibility to the disclosures. It was never discovered who killed Godfrey, but the Jesuits were immediately blamed. Then began a series of prosecutions running through several years, and resulting in the execution of a large number of Catholics, among them twenty-four priests and several noblemen. The evidence against these men is now admitted to have been the purest fabrication on the part of the brood of informers whom Oates's success had stimulated. At one time several thousand Catholics were jailed, and nearly thirty thousand of them expelled from London. The Duke of York (subsequently James II.) was forced into exile; the Queen herself was accused by Oates; and a measure was passed by which the Catholic peers were excluded from the House of Lords, to which they did not

again return for one hundred and fifty years.

Political leaders, like Shaftesbury, fomented the plot for partisan reasons, whether they credited it or not. There were undoubtedly many persons, aside from the Catholics, who saw the entire falseness of the imposture, but the mob spirit carried them off their feet or silenced them. Sir William Temple was threatened by Lord Fairfax for doubting the justice of executing certain priests. "He would tell everybody I was a Papist, affirming that the plot must be handled as if it were true, whether it was so or no." [1]

Such was this sanguinary hoax which for five years imposed on the English nation, dealing death to the innocent and controlling the politics of the court and commons. Oates was finally brought to justice, exposed, and severely punished; but he lived long enough to be pardoned and pensioned when William of Orange came to the throne.

[1] Temple, vol. ii. p. 506.

FOX: An indelible disgrace

"Although, . . . upon a review of this truly shocking transaction, we may be fairly justified in imputing to the greater part of those concerned in it rather an extraordinary degree of blind credulity than the deliberate wickedness of planning and assisting in the perpetration of legal murders; yet the proceedings on the popish plot must always be considered as an indelible disgrace upon the English nation, in which king, parliament, judges, witnesses, prosecutors have all their respective, though certainly not equal, shares."

C. J. Fox, History of the Early Part of the Reign of James II.

MACAULAY: The nation went mad

"The capital and the whole nation went mad with hatred and fear. The penal laws, which had begun to lose something of their edge, were sharpened anew. Everywhere justices were busied in searching houses and seizing papers. All the gaols were filled with Papists. London had the aspect of a city in a state of siege. The train-bands were under arms all night. Prepa-

rations were made for barricading the great thoroughfares. Patrols marched up and down the streets. Cannons were planted round Whitehall. No citizen thought himself safe unless he carried under his coat a small flail loaded with lead to brain the Popish assassins."

Lord Macaulay, History of England, vol. i. ch. ii.

GOLDWIN SMITH: The infamy of Oates

"Of all vile informers in the pillory of history, the highest stand Titus Oates and Bedloe, men of infamous characters and lives, who with stories of Catholic plots for the assassination of the king, the invasion of the kingdom, and the massacre of all Protestants, — monstrous as a maniac's dream, — swore away the lives of a long train of Roman Catholics, ending with the aged Lord Stafford and the blameless Archbishop Plunkett."

Goldwin Smith, United Kingdom, vol. vi. p. 42.

XXVI

THE LORD GORDON RIOTS

Bigotry has no head and cannot think, no heart and cannot feel. When she moves it is in wrath, when she pauses it is amidst ruin; her prayers are curses, her God is a demon, her communion is death. — O'CONNELL.

IN 1778 the British Parliament passed, without any serious opposition, a bill relieving Catholics from certain severe disabilities, under a statute passed in the reign of William III. Papists were again permitted, by this relief measure, to inherit lands and to sustain schools of their own. Immediately bigotry took offence. Protestant Associations were formed throughout England and Scotland to repeal the Catholic relief measure and to rivet the shackles. Lord George Gordon was president of these associations. Parliament paying little attention to their petitions, the Protestant

Associations were ordered by Gordon to come in a great body and present their petition *en masse*.

Out of their assemblage developed a numerous London mob (June, 1780), which, inflamed by fanatics and inspired by the pillage of liquor stores, started to purge London of the Papists. For several days the mobs had the metropolis of England more or less in their power. The prisons were opened, and the thief, the robber, and the incendiary came out to aid the cause. At one time thirty-six fires were raging within the city limits. Houses were looted and property was destroyed.[1]

The riots were finally put down by calling in the military forces, but not until five

[1] Edmund Burke describes the mob as made up of dissolute and unruly people. He himself was the object of attack because he had favored the law relieving Catholics of their disabilities. The leaders of the mob called him a Jesuit in disguise and nicknamed him "Neddy St. Omers." The residence of Lord Mansfield was destroyed, and the looting of Landale's distillery furnished the mob abundantly with liquor. It was necessary for people to chalk "No Popery" on their houses to save themselves from attack. Even the Jews put up signs on their homes, such as "This is the House of a True Protestant!"

hundred persons were killed and many millions of property destroyed. Lord Gordon went free of punishment, owing to the skilful defence of Erskine. His erratic career was closed with his conversion to Judaism in 1793, just prior to his death in Newgate prison.

LECKY: Gordon and his movement

"The worst part of the persecution of Catholics was based upon a law of William III., and in 1778 Sir George Savile introduced a bill to repeal those portions of this Act which related to the apprehending of Popish bishops, priests, and Jesuits, which subjected these and also Papists keeping a school to perpetual imprisonment, and which disabled all Papists from inheriting or purchasing land.

"It is an honorable fact that this Relief Bill was carried without a division in either House, without any serious opposition from the bench and with the concurrence of both parties in the State. The fanatical party had unfortunately acquired an unscrupulous leader in the person of Lord George Gordon, whose name now attained

a melancholy celebrity. He was a young man of thirty, of very ordinary talents, and with nothing to recommend him but his connection with the ducal house of Gordon. A Protestant association consisting of the worst agitators and fanatics was formed, and at a great meeting held on May 29, 1780, and presided over by Lord George Gordon, it was determined that twenty thousand men should march in the Parliament House to present a petition for the repeal of the Relief Act."

W. E. H. Lecky, History of England in the Eighteenth Century, vol. iii. ch. xiii.

GOLDWIN SMITH: "A Protestant maniac"

"A great anti-Catholic association was formed under Lord George Gordon, a Protestant maniac who ended by turning Jew. For three days the great city was in the hands of an infuriated and intoxicated rabble, which revelled in destruction, arson, and every kind of outrage."

Goldwin Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. ii. p. 230.

XXVII

MARYLAND LED THE WAY

Such was the commonwealth founded by a Catholic upon the broad moral law I have here laid down — that faith is an act of the will, and that to force men to profess what they do not believe is contrary to the law of God, and to generate faith by force is morally impossible. — CARDINAL MANNING.

IN the last and revised edition of Bancroft's History of the United States, that sweeping credit which he gave to Lord Baltimore and the Catholic colonists of Maryland, as the first to establish religious toleration and freedom of conscience on this continent, is considerably toned down.

Bancroft seems to have been more or less influenced by the researches and arguments of a school of historical writers who rather resented the disposition of Catholic writers to plume themselves on the Maryland

instance. The controversy has continued since Bancroft's death; and there are now more materials available upon which to base a fair conclusion.

Maryland was settled in 1634; Rhode Island was settled in 1636, — the former under the auspices of the Catholic Lord Baltimore, the latter under the auspices of the expelled Salem preacher, Roger Williams. The Calverts (who founded the Maryland colony) as well as Williams proceeded in their new enterprises on a plan of toleration; Williams's plan being somewhat more indefinite though broader in theory than that of the Maryland proprietor, but the Maryland experiment having the merit of being a practical exhibition of toleration from the outset.

In both colonies a condition of religious freedom existed from the first settlement. Bancroft says in his last edition (vol. i. p. 162), in speaking of the Maryland colony: "Toleration grew up in the colony silently, as a custom of the land." Of course, as a matter of chronology, Maryland being settled A. D. 1634 and Rhode Island A. D.

1636, the credit of being the first colony to establish religious freedom belongs to Maryland.

To Maryland also belongs the credit for the first duly enacted law of toleration (April 21, 1649).

Both colonies had earlier declarations on the subject, but these declarations and directions were without the sanction of direct legislation.

Thus in 1633 (according to the "Calvert Papers"), Lord Baltimore, in the first article of his instructions to his Lieutenant-Governor, Leonard Calvert, and commissioners, directed that "no scandal or offence be given to any of the Protestants" who were among the colonists, — that they "treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit." (Browne's George and Cecilius Calvert, pp. 46–47, 27 Maryland Hist. Society, 32.) In 1638 a Catholic was fined for speaking disrespectfully of Protestants. "Thus . . .", says Brown (History of a Palatinate, p. 70), "the principle of toleration was enforced and placed on record." In 1639 the second assemblage of the Colonial

lawmakers of Maryland "conferred to all Christian inhabitants of Maryland all liberties which an Englishman enjoyed at home" (Bancroft, vol. i. p. 164); and in 1640 another enactment was "practically interpreted as in harmony with that toleration of all believers in the divinity of Jesus Christ which was the recognized usage of the land" (Bancroft, vol. i. p. 165). (These citations are from the last edition of Bancroft's History.)

The compact drawn by Roger Williams in 1636 impliedly rules out any legislation on matters of conscience by declaring that the settlers bind themselves to submit to all orders of the governing body "only in civil things." In 1640 there were declarations by the town of Newport that "none be accounted a delinquent for Doctrine," and in 1641 that "liberty of conscience in point of Doctrine is perpetuated." These were declarations of principles, but of course not specific enactments.

The charter of 1643 was silent on the subject of religious freedom. It was not until the charter of 1663 was granted that the usage of toleration in Rhode Island was

clearly and openly intrenched in the law. The charter declared that "no person should be molested or disqualified or called into question for any difference of opinion in matters of religion."

How Rhode Island's toleration would have stood the test if it covered a condition of affairs which found Catholics and Protestants dwelling side by side (as in Maryland), is purely a matter of conjecture.[1] Up to 1680, according to Governor Sanford, no Catholics had settled in Rhode Island (Chalmers' Political Annals, p. 284); but in the year 1719 a law was enacted (with very little danger visible, in justification) excluding Catholics from all political rights in Rhode Island.

"To Jews who had inquired if they could

[1] The mere profession of a belief in "liberty of conscience" did not in those days mean what it does in our days. It meant just what it might be interpreted to mean. Thus, Cromwell during his Irish campaign, in negotiating for the surrender of an Irish fortress, wrote the Governor of Ross to say that he "would not meddle with any man's conscience," but added, "If by liberty of conscience you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass [the Catholic form of worship], I judge it best to use plain dealing and to tell you now that where the Parliament of England have power, that will not be allowed of."

find a home in Rhode Island, the assembly of 1684 made answer: 'We declare that they may expect as good protection here as any stranger not being of our nation, residing among us, ought to have.'" (Bancroft, vol. i. p. 365.)

This was offering the Jews hardly any better status than that of the Indians, and one capable of any sort of interpretation.

The Maryland experiment in religious toleration was a practical one, from the outset, in that Catholics and Protestants were settled side by side, and also in that the invitation to Protestant settlers was express and cordial. There is testimony to the effect that a majority of the first colonists (counting the servants) were Protestants. Johnson, in "The Foundation of Maryland" (p. 32), says of the first colonists of Maryland: "128 out of 220 were Protestants." The freeholders, or freemen, however, were mostly Catholics, and under the Charter only the freemen exercised political rights. Browne, in his "History of a Palatinate" (p. 70), concludes that down to 1642 there was no Protestant church nor Protestant

minister in the Maryland colony. Father White's Relation (p. 25) informs us that in 1638 many of the Protestant settlers had become converts.

Governor Sharpe's MS. letter book, under date of Dec. 15, 1758, states that "a majority of the inhabitants were confirmed Papists till the revolution [of 1688]."

Be this as it may, there is no doubt that the inspiring influence for religious freedom in Maryland proceeded from Lord Baltimore and his Catholic heirs and successors in the proprietary government, and that the controlling power under which religious toleration was fostered lay in the Catholic majority of the first local assemblages. From the very outset the Protestants were not merely free to exercise their religion, but the freemen among them participated equally with the Catholic freemen in the offices of the colony. Captain Thomas Cornwaleys, a Protestant, was one of the most important figures from the first years of the colony. He was a member of the Council, and later commander of the forces and Assistant Governor. Thus we have in the Maryland colony a status, not merely of

toleration, but something very much resembling religious equality. Lord Baltimore, in appointing a Protestant governor in 1648, prescribed an oath containing the following significant paragraph:

"Nor will I make any differences of persons in conferring offices, rewards, or favors proceeding from the authority which his said lordship has conferred upon me, as his lieutenant here, for or in respect of their said religion respectively, but merely as I shall find them faithful and well deserving of his said lordship and to the best of my understanding endowed with moral virtues and abilities fitting for such rewards, offices, or favors."

The famous Act of Toleration of 1649 was drafted by Lord Baltimore himself, and approved by the Colonial Assembly without any alteration. This law, although not comparing with our present status of religious equality, was far in advance of the political ethics of the day. Its leading provision was as follows:

"Be it therefore also by the lord proprietary, with the advice and assent of this assembly, ordained and enacted, except as in

this present case is before declared and set forth, that no person or persons whatsoever within this province of the islands, ports, harbors, creeks or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesu Christ shall from henceforth be any wise troubled, molested or discountenanced for or in his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof within this province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to beleefe or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent." [1] (See Bacon's Laws of Maryland, 1649, vol. i.; McMahon's History of Maryland, p. 226; Bozman's History of Maryland, vol. ii. p. 335, and McSherry's History of Maryland, p. 65, "Proceedings and Acts of Assembly;" Maryland Historical Society Publications, 1883, pp. 244–247; Scharf's History, vol. i. pp. 174–177.)

[1] After the severe penal codes of the times the Maryland Act also enacts punishment of death against any one who should blaspheme or curse God or deny Christ or the Trinity. By the law of Scotland blasphemy was punishable by death. Any one convicted for the third time of reasoning against the persons of the Trinity was doomed to death by a statute passed in the reign of William III. (1695, ch. ii.).

The comments of two leading American jurists on this subject are here subjoined; subsequent research has not materially impaired the justice of their observation.

Mr. Justice Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution," said: "It is certainly very honorable to the liberality and public spirit of the proprietary that he should have introduced into his fundamental policy the doctrine of general toleration and equality among Christian sects (for he does not appear to have gone further), and have thus given the earliest example of a legislator inviting his subjects to the free indulgence of religious opinion. This was anterior to the settlement of Rhode Island, and therefore merits the enviable rank of being the first recognition among the colonists of the glorious and indefeasible rights of conscience."

Kent, in his "Commentary on American Law," says: "This legislative act of Maryland, in favor of religious toleration, was prior in time to any in America, if not in any country "(vol. ii. part iv. sec. 24, p. 36). And further: "The charter of Rhode Island of 1663 established a freedom of religious opinion and worship with extraordinary lib-

erality for that early period of New England history."

BROWNE: Maryland first

"While as yet there was no spot in Christendom where religious beliefs were free and when even the Commons of England had declared against tolerations, he [Baltimore] founded a community wherein no man was to be molested for his faith."

W. H. Browne (Librarian of Johns Hopkins University), History of a Palatinate: Maryland, ch. iii. p. 45.

LODGE: Toleration from the outset

"Yet there can be no doubt of the fact of religious toleration in Maryland at the very outset, and there were two very good reasons for its existence. The all-powerful Lord Proprietary and the principal men in Maryland were Catholics, and Catholicism was oppressed and hated in England. To oppress Catholics would have been great folly on the part of Protestant colonists, and to oppress Protestants would have been ruin to the proprietary."

Lodge, History of the English Colonies in America, New York, 1882, p. 97.

FISKE: Lord Baltimore himself drew the Act of Toleration

"This famous statute, commonly known as the 'Toleration Act,' was drawn up by Cecilius [Lord Baltimore] himself, and passed the assembly exactly as it came from him without amendment."

John Fiske, Old Virginia and her Neighbors, vol. i. p. 309.

FISKE: A liberal act for the age

"Nevertheless for the age in which it was enacted this statute was eminently liberal, and it certainly reflects great credit on Lord Baltimore. . . . Such a policy as was announced in this memorable Toleration Act was not easy to realize in the seventeenth century."

John Fiske, Old Virginia, vol. i. p. 311.

JOHNSON: Toleration in Maryland

"From 1634 until 1689 no man was ever molested in Maryland on account of his religious opinions, except in the short intervals of Ingle's occupation, the sway of the Protector's Commissioners, and Fendall's brief usurpation."

Johnson, The Foundation of Maryland, p. 156.

BROWNE: Religion of the first settlers of Maryland

"It seems probable that most of the 'gentlemen adventurers,' as they were called, were Catholics, and most of the laborers and servants, Protestants."

Browne, Hist. of a Palatinate: Maryland, p. 22.

JOHNSON: Conclusions of fact

"First: That Lord Baltimore did not undertake the management and development of this Province 'without any special sense of responsibility to the community,' and 'that religious toleration in Maryland must be not attributed solely to the very commonplace motive of self-interest.'

"Second: That the Act concerning religion was not the 'echo' of any British order, or ordinance of the Long Parliament, securing or declaring Religious Toleration, because the Puritans in England always, and on every occasion, when in power, persecuted all who differed with them in opinion, nor was it the work of the Protestant majority in the Province, because whenever they obtained control of the Government, they immediately followed the

example of their fellows at home in persecuting all others, as in 1645 under Ingle, in 1654 under Cromwell's Commissioners, and in 1659 under Fendall, the renegade Governor of Baltimore." (p. 157.)

"Cecil Calvert died on Nov. 30, 1675, and was succeeded by his son, Charles, who retained the control of the Province until it was wrested from him by the Revolution of the Protestant Association in 1689. The life of Cecil was spent in struggles to found and maintain the institutions of liberty in Maryland. From June 20, 1632, until his death, more than forty-three years, he had passed through the most eventful epoch of English history. He saw Parliamentary institutions overthrown, and the whole power of government usurped by the king. He saw the monarchy destroyed, and all governmental functions absorbed by the Parliament. He witnessed the expulsion of the Parliament again, and liberty and law prostrate under the dominion of the sword, and then he lived to see the ancient balance of the Constitution restored, with Kings, Lords, and Commons re-established, after an interregnum of nearly twenty years, and

right and justice once again trampled upon, in the frenzy of a political and religious reaction. Under all these extraordinary convulsions of society, and revolutions of government, he succeeded in planting and preserving in Maryland the rights of legislation by the freemen, of Habeas Corpus, of Trial by Jury, of Parliamentary taxation, of security of Martial Law, and of Liberty of Conscience." (pp. 154–155.)

"He [Lord Baltimore] therefore adopted and declared that [Liberty of Conscience] to be the principle on which the foundations of Maryland should be laid, and he from the first intended to secure all those rights, privileges, and franchises, not alone to Roman Catholics, nor yet alone to Englishmen, but to all Christian people of all the nations of all the world. That in doing this he was supported by the whole social influence of the Roman Catholics of England and the power of the Society of Jesus, who thereby sought to secure for members of their Church Religious Liberty denied them in England. From the landing at St. Mary's on the 27th of March, 1634, to this day, Liberty of Con-

science has been the fundamental institution of Maryland. Under it the Puritans settled at Province, the Quakers at West River, and the Presbyterians on the Patuxent." (pp. 158–159.)

Bradley T. Johnson, The Foundation of Maryland and the Origin of the Act concerning Religion, of April 21, 1649.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMO[illegible] CALIF.

BX
946
D4
1901

Desmond, Humphrey Joseph, 1858-1932.
Mooted questions of history / by Humphre
J. Desmond. -- Rev. ed. -- Boston : Marlie
1902, c1900.
viii, 328p. ; 19cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. History--Addresses, essays, lectures.
2. Reformation--Addresses, essays, lecture
3. Catholic Church--History--Addresses, es
lectures. I. Title.